Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-060
Wednesday
28 March 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-060 *28 March 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov 27 Mar Briefing on World Affairs 1
U.S. Resolution on Lithuania *[TASS]* 1
Invitation to Former Afghan King *[TASS]* 1
INF Treaty on SS-23's *[TASS]* 1
U.S. Senate Resolution on Jerusalem *[TASS]* 2
Gremitskikh Says Foreigners Barred From Lithuania *[TASS]* 2
U.S. Senate Resolution on Jerusalem Assailed *[TASS]* 2
Plans for Fiber-Optic Link Via USSR Opposed *[IZVESTIYA 25 Mar]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Senator Kennedy Continues Visit to USSR 4
Addresses Journalists in Moscow *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 4
Meets With General Chervov *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Mar]* 4
Holds Discussion With Akhromeyev *[TASS]* 4
U.S. Admiral Crowe Interviewed on USSR Visit *[Moscow International]* 4
U.S. National Guard Chief on Force Reductions *[TASS]* 5
U.S. Electoral Group Visits Russian Federation *[TASS]* 5
Venture Planned With U.S. in Electronic Mail *[PRAVDA 24 Mar]* 6

China

Li Peng Meets Soviet Journalists in Beijing *[TASS]* 6
'Vremya' Comments on Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 6
Li Peng Discusses Sino-Soviet Relations *[Moscow International]* 7
Lebedev Assesses Soviet-Chinese Relations *[Moscow International]* 7
CPC Delegation Continues Visit in USSR *[Moscow International]* 8

Northeast Asia

ROK Group in Moscow Enroute to DPRK *[Seoul CHOSON ILBO 28 Mar]* 8
Visit to Pyongyang Denied *[Seoul Radio]* 8
Gorbachev Sends Reply Letter to ROK Delegation *[Seoul THE KOREA HERALD 27 Mar]* 8
IZVESTIYA Interviews Kim Yong-sam *[25 Mar]* 9
Radio Moscow Airs Interview of Kim Yong-sam *[Moscow International]* 10
Kim Yong-sam Hints About Ties With Soviet Union *[Seoul YONHAP]* 11
South Korean Military Program Criticized *[Moscow International]* 12
Academician Frolov on Cooperation With ROK *[TASS]* 12
Moscow-Seoul Air Service To Begin 29 Mar *[Moscow International]* 12
DPRK Leadership Mobilizes Youth Detachments *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 13

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Laos' Phomvihan Writes Article in PRAVDA *[22 Mar]* 15
Laos' Economic Problems, New Policy Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Mar]* 17
Commentary Examines U.S. Statement on Burma *[Moscow International]* 18

Near East & South Asia

Andreyev on Majlis-Government Controversies *[Moscow International]* 19
Parliamentarians Complete Visit to North Yemen *[IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]* 20
Arbatov Discusses Arab Relations, Detente *[Kuwati AL-ANBA' 23 Mar]* 21
India's Troop Pullout From Sri Lanka Viewed *[Moscow International]* 22
USSR-Morocco Culture-Science Pact Signed *[TASS]* 23

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Holds Talks With Nigeria's Lukman *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 23
Official Discusses Lusaka Mandela Talks *[Moscow International]* 23
CPSU Delegation Sets Off on Visit to Zambia *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 24

East Europe

Soviet Government Issues Statement on GDR *[TASS]* 24
Withdrawal of GDR Treason Charges Noted *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 25
TV Viewers Question East European Developments *[Moscow TV]* 25

West Europe

Defense Minister Yazov Visits France 27 Mar 33
Seen Off at Airport *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Mar]* 33
Meets French Counterpart *[Moscow TV]* 33
Meets With Prime Minister Rocard *[PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 33
Speaks at Military School *[TASS]* 34
Received by President Mitterrand *[TASS]* 34
France's Mitterrand on USSR, Germany, Europe *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 34
French Feel 'Triumphant' on Lithuanian Events *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 35
French Economic Minister Holds Talks in Moscow 35
Soviets 'To Pay Off Their Debts' *[Paris Radio]* 35
Voronin, Beregovoy View Cooperation *[TASS]* 35
Ryzhkov Receives Beregovoy *[TASS]* 36
Ryzhkov Urges 'Updating' Cooperation *[PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 36
Beregovoy Comments on Lithuania *[Paris Radio]* 37
Rocard, Genscher Cited on Security, German Unity *[IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]* 37
Soviet-British Relations 'Clouded' by Gordiyevskiy *[Moscow TV]* 37

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Carries 27 Mar Supreme Soviet Session 39
Lukyanov Opens Session 39
Planning and Budget Officials Speak 40
Amendments to Tax Bill Discussed 40
Sobchak Speaks on Inflation 41
Deputies Support Bill, Debate Ends 42
MVD Law Approved 43
Joint Session To Meet USSR Government *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Regular Sessions Planned *[TASS]* 44
Three Hours Devoted to Questions *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Supreme Soviet Discusses Taxation Bills *[TASS]* 44
State Committee for Nationalities Formed *[TASS]* 44
Lukyanov on Amendments to Internal Troops Law *[Moscow TV]* 45
Abalkin on Draft Law on Nationalities Issues *[Moscow TV]* 45

Political & Social

Gorbachev Opens First Presidential Council Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 46

Text of Gorbachev Speech *[PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 47
'Vremya' Interviews Gorbachev 27 Mar *[Moscow TV]* 51
Composition, Role of Presidential Council Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 53
Members Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 54
Members Comment on Tasks *[TASS]* 54
Primakov Resigns as Council of Union Chairman *[TASS]* 54
Draft CPSU Statutes Published 28 Mar *[PRAVDA]* 54
'Democratic Platform' Arguments Rebutted *[PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 61
KGB Official Denies Yeltsin Claim *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* 63
KGB Archive Material on Display *[TASS]* 63
Frolov Talks to KGB Leaders, Activists *[TASS]* 63
Moscow Worker Deputy Speaks on Candidacy *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Mar]* 64
Deputies Comment on Republic Secession *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 11]* 65
Leading Cadres Study Ethnic Relations Problems *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Mar]* 66
Hidden Pressure on Lawmakers Alleged *[MOSCOW NEWS No 11]* 66
'Panic' at Publishing House Over Paper Shortage *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Mar]* 68
Trade Workers Said To Smuggle Goods to Poland *[IZVESTIYA 20 Mar]* 69

Economic

Petrakov Interviewed on Soviet Economy *[Paris LE MONDE 24 Mar]* 69
Creation of 'Free Economic Zones' Planned *[TASS]* 72
Decision To Cancel Volga-Don Canal Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]* 72
Gold Mining Associations To Halt Work, Disband *[Moscow International]* 74

Agricultural

Early-March Weather, Crop Conditions Outlined *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 Mar]* 74
Agricultural Developments for 8-14 March *[Moscow Radio]* 74

Scientific

'Cosmos-2063' Satellite Launched 27 March *[TASS]* 75
Cosmonauts Conduct Experiments Aboard Mir *[TASS]* 75

Military

Yazov, Lizichev Address Army Writers Meeting *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Mar]* 75
Military Official Interviewed on Desertions *[Moscow Radio]* 76
Former Colonel Examines CPSU Platform *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Mar]* 77

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Mazowiecki Agrees To Mediate for Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 78
Landsbergis Calls for Law on Military Service *[Vilnius Radio]* 78
Volunteer Militias To Protect Public Buildings *[Vilnius International]* 78
Lithuanian Deputy Protests Party School Intrusion *[Vilnius Radio]* 78
Lithuanian Red Cross Protests Hospital Stormings *[Vilnius Radio]* 78
Lithuanian Minister Blames Ryzhkov for Problems *[Vienna DER STANDARD 28 Mar]* 78
Eviction of Communists in Lithuania Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Mar]* 79
Lithuanian Official on 'Mass Exodus' of Russians *[TASS]* 80
Lithuania Situation Remains 'Complex, Tense' *[TASS]* 81
Paper Asserts Tension 'Fueled' by Sajudis *[TRUD 27 Mar]* 82
Landsbergis Interviewed on Conflict With Moscow *[Hamburg BILD 26 Mar]* 83
Reportage on 27 Mar Vilnius Pro-Moscow Rally 84
No Incidents Reported *[Vilnius International]* 84
More on Vilnius Rally *[Moscow TV]* 84
TASS on Rally 85
Lithuanian Situation Reviewed by Soviet Press *[TASS]* 85

General on Lithuanian Campaign Against Military *[TASS]* 86
Lithuania Said Attempting To Discredit Army *[TASS]* 86
Yazov Denies 'Armed Actions' in Lithuania *[Moscow TV]* 87
Lithuanian CP Official Explains Army Action *[Moscow TV]* 87
Defense Ministry Officials Meet With Servicemen *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Mar]* 87
Views on Laws Against Loyalist Party Members *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Mar]* 88
PRAVDA on 'Political Marathon' in Lithuania *[28 Mar]* 89
Lithuanian Ministers Meet With Senator Kennedy *[Vilnius International]* 90
Vilnius Radio Continues 27 Mar Council Session 90
Minister of Communication Confirmed 90
Landsbergis Addresses 27 Mar Council Session *[Vilnius Radio]* 90
Text of Landsbergis, Prunskiene Note to Gorbachev *[Vilnius Radio]* 91
Internal Affairs Minister Addresses Council *[Vilnius Radio]* 92
Prosecutor Gives Account of Hospital Raids *[Vilnius Radio]* 92
Brazauskas on Occupation of Party Building *[Vilnius Radio]* 93
Council Statement on USSR Security Committee *[Vilnius Radio]* 93
Appeals Issued at 27 Mar Council Session 94
To Helsinki Act Signatories *[Lithuanian Radio]* 94
To Physicians of the World *[Lithuanian Radio]* 94
Scientists Appeal to World Intellectuals *[Vilnius Radio]* 94
Appeals to U.S., World Trade Unions for Support *[Vilnius Radio]* 95
Vilnius Students Issue Appeal to Gorbachev *[Vilnius Radio]* 95
Journalists Warned Against 'Provocations' *[Vilnius Radio]* 95
Gorbachev Decrees on Lithuania Appraised *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 28 Mar]* 96
Swedish Reporter on Russian Demonstration *[Stockholm Radio]* 97
Lithuanian Prime Minister Views Polish Ties *[Warsaw PAP]* 97
Poland's Geremek Urges 'Dialogue' in Lithuania *[Warsaw TV]* 97
Warsaw Embassy Official Discusses Lithuania *[Warsaw Radio]* 97
Polish-Lithuanian Communique Issued in Vilnius *[Warsaw PAP]* 98
Spain, Italy Urge Caution on Lithuania *[TASS]* 98
Lithuania's European Integration Discussed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 22 Mar]* 98
Identity of Army Commander Arouses Concern *[Prague CTK]* 99
Lithuanian Run-off Election Results *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 13 Mar]* 100
Isayev Compares German Reunification, Lithuania *[Moscow Radio]* 102
Estonian Body Cables Gorbachev on Lithuania *[Tallinn Radio]* 102
Estonian Congress 'Defeat' for Communists *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 14 Mar]* 102
Estonian Deputies Discuss Party Split *[Moscow TV]* 103
Estonian Communist Interviewed on Party Split *[TASS]* 104
New Director for Estonian Telegraph Agency *[Tallinn RAHVA HAAL 27 Mar]* 104

RSFSR

RSFSR Local Election Results Summarized *[TASS]* 104
Moscow Gorkom's Present Role Surveyed *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 105
Stavropol Kraykom Chairman Elected *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Mar]* 108

Western Republics

Ukraine Bans Scheduled Pro-Lithuania Rally *[TASS]* 108
Ukrainian Communists on Organizational Resolutions *[Kiev Radio]* 108
Attempts To Remove Party From Industry Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 108
Party Responds *[PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 109
Religious Conflict in Ukraine Intensifying *[Kiev International]* 109
Kiev Youth Meeting Demands Ukraine Secession *[Moscow International]* 109
Ukrainian Deputies Examine Multiparty System *[Kiev International]* 110
Ukraine's 'Rukh' Resists Move to Form Party *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 111
Report on Student Strikes Held in Ukraine *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 7 Mar]* 111
Belorussian Communist Party Plenum Held *[Moscow Radio]* 112
Adopts Appeal to Lithuania *[Moscow Radio]* 112
Situation in Moldavia Reported 'Deteriorating' *[Moscow International]* 112

Caucasus

Armenian Party Leader Discusses Restoration *[Yerevan International]* 112
Situation Remains Tense on Armenian Border 113
Emergency Declaration Urged *[Baku Radio]* 113
Azerbaijan Asks For 'Safety' Measures *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 113
Troops' 'Pressure' on Armenian Villagers Denied *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Mar]* 113
Armenian Leader Advocates Independence *[Vienna WOCHENPRESSE 23 Mar]* 114
Armenian Party Committee Discusses Platform *[Yerevan Radio]* 114
Yerevan Experiences Air Link Difficulties *[Yerevan Radio]* 115
Azerbaijan Report on Presidential Rule Disputed *[ARMENPRES]* 115
Yazov Clarifies Baku-Sumgait Highway Accident *[MOSCOW NEWS No 12]* 115
Stolen Explosives Recovered in Azerbaijan *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Mar]* 116
USSR-Iran Border Opened For New Year Festival *[Baku Radio]* 116
Gumbaridze Speaks at Georgian Komsomol Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 116
NKAO Soviet Decides To Resume Functions *[Yerevan Radio]* 116
Dispute Over NKAO Radio, Television Continues *[Yerevan Radio]* 117
Transcaucasus Rail Traffic Halted Again *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 117

Central Asia

Newly Elected Uzbek President Interviewed *[TASS]* 117
Uzbekistan Supreme Soviet Meets, Views Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 118
Preliminary Kazakh Election Results Published *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 118
Electoral Turnout Viewed *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 118
Kazakh Party Central Committee Plenum Reported *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 118
Reportage on Commission for Time, Standard Hours 119
Kazakhstan on Summertime Hours *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 119
Turkmenia Not on Summertime Hours *[Ashkhabad Radio]* 119
Tajikistan Not on Summertime Hours *[Dushanbe Radio]* 119

Gerasimov 27 Mar Briefing on World Affairs

U.S. Resolution on Lithuania

LD2703143190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1332 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS)—Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, today qualified the resolution adopted on 22 March this year by the U.S. Senate concerning the sovereign Soviet Republic of Lithuania as "obvious interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet state" and as "an act which contradicts the norms and principles of international law."

The right of a union republic to self-determination, going as far as separation and departure from the composition of the USSR is guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution and was confirmed by the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, stressed the diplomat. The procedure for resolving such questions will be determined by the USSR Supreme Soviet. A draft law on the subject is currently being considered in the Soviet parliament and until it is adopted "any attempts and declarations about separation will be considered as unlawful and invalid," he said.

The representative of the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry noted that the statement by the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet with regard to it leaving the composition of the union is unlawful, and, he added, this was stated by the Supreme Soviet and the USSR president. "Union legislation has, as in any federative state, priority over the legislation of a territory which is a part of the federation," he stressed, "and this should be well known to U.S. legislators."

Gennadiy Gerasimov also noted the "unacceptable, ultimative tone of a number of points in the resolution" of the U.S. Senate. "The Soviet side, more than anyone else, is interested in settling the situation that has taken shape in Lithuania by means of political dialogue," stressed the representative of the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry. "We have stated this many times, including at the highest level."

"The attempt undertaken by the U.S. Senate to influence the dynamics and nature of processes that are taking place in our country leads not to a settlement of the situation, but on the contrary, aggravates the situation, exacerbates confrontation between various groups of the population in Lithuania, and can become a kind of detonator in that already complex and potentially explosive situation in that Baltic republic," he added.

Invitation to Former Afghan King

LD2703162990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1440 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS)—The invitation to the former King of Afghanistan Zahir Shah to take part in a constituent congress of the national mass organization, the Peace Front, which is to be the basis for a future coalition government "is in line with previous constructive proposals" by the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan and is aimed at establishing peace on Afghan soil." This is how the head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs commented on the report from information agencies that Farid Mazdak, member of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, has said that the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan invites the former king of Afghanistan and other representatives of the Afghan emigration to take part in the forum.

The Afghan leadership has come up with various initiatives on more than one occasion, aimed at urging opposition groupings toward constructive dialogue with the aim of achieving a political settlement, the representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs stressed. He recalled recent proposals from President Najibullah in this connection. Among them, Gennadiy Gerasimov singled out the sending of delegations to Peshawar and Tehran for talks about the issues of national reconciliation and the proposal to summon "an all-Afghan National Shura in Kabul, some other town of Afghanistan or a third country, during which it would be possible to determine a mechanism for an internal Afghan settlement."

INF Treaty on SS-23's

LD2703182190 Moscow TASS in English 1751 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS—The Soviet Union completely fulfilled its obligations under the INF Treaty on the elimination of OTR-23 (SS-23) missile systems, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

He made this statement in response to Western allegations that Soviet missiles of the above type were uncovered in the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia.

The spokesman said at the same time that "in compliance with its obligations under earlier agreements, the Soviet Union supplied the GDR, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria with OTR-23 missile systems long before the signing of the INF Treaty."

"There were and there are no nuclear warheads to missiles supplied to those countries," Gerasimov stressed.

These missile systems, "including non-nuclear warheads, are the property of the GDR, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria and are not covered by the INF Treaty", the spokesman said.

U.S. Senate Resolution on Jerusalem

LD2703212590 Moscow TASS in English 2109 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—"The USSR's stance on the problem of Jerusalem is well known and remains invariable: We regard East Jerusalem as an integral part of the West Bank of the Jordan River, occupied by Israel," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today, commenting on the recent resolution on Jerusalem, adopted by the U.S. Senate.

Gerasimov recalled the stance on this issue by the U.S. Administration, which lets talks within the framework of the Middle Eastern settlement to define final status for this city. He said the U.S. Senate's resolution reflected an attempt to forestall the development of events and impose one's own viewpoint.

"This move can create additional obstacles to forging a peace process in the Middle East," Gerasimov stressed.

Gremitskikh Says Foreigners Barred From Lithuania

LD2703135790 Moscow TASS in English 1342 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—A number of measures, including those concerning foreign citizens' entry and stay on the territory of the Baltic Republic of Lithuania, have been taken in accordance with the Soviet President's March 21, 1990 decree "On Additional Measures to Ensure the Rights of Soviet Citizens and Protection of the USSR's Sovereignty on the Territory of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]." Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh said at a briefing here today.

Foreign citizens are asked to leave Lithuania and to temporarily refrain from entering it," [no opening quote as received] he said. "This also refers to foreign diplomats, commercial representatives and journalists, accredited to the USSR."

Moscow-accredited foreign correspondents, now in Lithuania, should leave the territory of the union republic when their permission expires," [no opening quote as received] Gremitskikh said, stressing "that the measure is temporary."

U.S. Senate Resolution on Jerusalem Assailed

LD2803083390 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 27 Mar 90

[By TASS news analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—The U.S. Senate adopted a resolution, that alleges that Jerusalem is and should remain the capital of the state of Israel. The resolution, which clearly owes a great deal to the efforts by the pro-Israeli lobby, aims to lend legitimacy to the Israeli occupation of the eastern (Arab) part of the ancient city.

The United States, like the majority of other countries, does not recognise Jerusalem as Israel's capital and maintains its embassy in Tel Aviv. The Senate's resolution would seem to be prodding the Bush administration to revise its stance and renounce the decision to let Arab-Israeli talks decide the sovereignty of Jerusalem.

This demarche by the Senate also seems to have been made in response to recent statements by administration officials, denouncing various actions by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, who has tried to prove that Jerusalem is an indivisible part of the Jewish state.

The problem of Jerusalem emerged in 1980, when the Israeli Knesset adopted the law stipulating the annexation of the eastern part of Jerusalem and proclaimed the city to be the internal and indivisible capital of Israel.

Arab countries immediately expressed their indignation over this unlawful action, which denies Muslims their sacred possession, and described it as a flagrant challenge to the entire Muslim world and the public at large.

The majority of countries supported the Arab position. This solidarity was expressed in U.N. General Assembly Resolution 36/120 of 1981, which demanded that Israel withdraw fully and unconditionally from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including the eastern part of Jerusalem.

The present demarche by the U.S. Senate displays open contempt by American lawmakers of the historic rights of the Arab people of Palestine, who consider Jerusalem as their capital.

The position adopted by the Sentate is viewed as a violation of international law, an attempt to establish serious obstacles to a lasting, just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle Eastern conflict.

By adopting the resolution on Jerusalem, U.S. senators have forcefully demonstrated that they side with Tel Aviv in the Arab-Israeli confrontation. This move can be expected to affect the United States' relations with the Arab world.

The resolution by the U.S. Senate actually undercuts efforts by the world public to convene a U.N.-sponsored international conference on the Middle East. The United Nations is, possibly, the sole real forum today where the search for peaceful solutions to the protracted Arab-Israeli conflict can take place.

Any attempt to change Jerusalem's special status and thus destroy the unique cultural and religious nature of its holy places, will put any chances for peace in the region in serious jeopardy.

Plans for Fiber-Optic Link Via USSR Opposed

PM2603114690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Blinov report: "Tripping Up a Project"]

[Text] Washington—The U.S. National Security Agency (NSA) is standing in the way of a project for uninterrupted telephone communications between Europe and East Asia.

The "bugging department," as the NSA is sometimes called, because it is engaged on a global scale in the secret interception of conversations by telephone and other lines of communication, is opposing plans to build a fiber-optic communications line between the countries of West Europe and Japan through Soviet territory. The project, which uses sophisticated communications technology—the transmission of a signal by a fiber-optic line—is intended to significantly expand information exchanges between the European countries and Japan and other Pacific coast states. Three fiber-optic lines—from northern, central, and southern Europe—are to meet in Kaliningrad near Moscow, in order to continue in the direction of Vladivostok by a trans-Siberian line, and on to Japan.

The project will be costly at $500 million, but this expenditure, in the opinion of experts, will result in considerable economic benefit. It is acknowledged that capital investments in developing communications systems are the most productive in terms of return on capital. Telephone companies in Britain, Japan, Italy, Austria, Denmark, and the FRG have shown an interest in implementing the line together with the USSR Ministry of Communications. A leading American corporation in the communications sphere, U.S. West, wanted to join them. Together, they formed a consortium to implement the trans-Siberian project.

The NSA is opposed to the American company's participation in implementing the telephone line, and indeed to the project as a whole. The NSA is displeased because the sophisticated means of communication will be used, along with other clients, by the Soviet Union—the country through whose territory the communications line will run. The NSA leadership claims that the project "will strengthen Soviet military potential." But in reality, as THE WASHINGTON POST reports, the NSA is worried about the possibility of a devaluation of its investments in the telephone interception system. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the NSA has spent billions of dollars on spy satellites that are engaged, among other things, in intercepting Soviet radiotelephone transmissions. According to former Pentagon staffer Frank Gaffney, "the Soviet fiber-optic network will make the monitoring of Soviet communications extremely difficult."

At present the NSA is trying to prevent the issuing of export licenses for American techology intended for the trans-Siberian project. As THE WASHINGTON POST recalled in this connection, the American Administration has recently repeatedly declared its willingness to slacken restrictions on exports of technology to socialist countries. The case of the "trans-Siberian project" will show how sincere these assurances are.

United States & Canada

U.S. Senator Kennedy Continues Visit to USSR

Addresses Journalists in Moscow

PM2803102690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Meeting With Journalists"]

[Text] In a press conference at the Foreign Ministry press center March 26, Democratic Senator E. Kennedy, chairman of the U.S. Congress Senate Committee for Labor and Human Resources, noted the existence of wide opportunities for developing cooperation in various spheres between the United States and the USSR.

Sharing his impressions from his conversation with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, the senator noted that a significant part of the meeting was devoted to discussing the situation in Lithuania. In their conversation the two men exchanged opinions about the radical changes taking place in the Soviet Union.

Answering a question about the future of Soviet-U.S. relations, the senator said: "I visited your country three times in the seventies. Then the absence of dialogue between the USSR and the United States could be clearly sensed; there was enmity, suspicion, and mistrust. Now we have established a genuine dialogue and discussions at the highest level. And I think that we are witnessing growing progress in areas such as arms control. Apart from that, we are seeing the growth of trust and of business contacts in the spheres of science and technology, and trade. All this forms the basis for further progress and mutual understanding."

Meets With General Chervov

PM2803142990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Meeting at the USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Text] A meeting was held 26 March at the USSR Defense Ministry between Colonel General N.F. Chervov, chief of a USSR Armed Forces General Staff Directorate, and U.S. Senator E. Kennedy.

During the conversation military-political aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations and problems connected with the European process were discussed. In particular, in connection with the prospect of concluding a treaty on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms, the U.S. side raised the question of banning the modernization of certain nuclear systems. Col. Gen. N.F. Chervov noted that a decision to ban modernization must apply to all components of strategic offensive arms and delivery vehicles possessed by the USSR and the United States.

Col. Gen. N.F. Chervov asked the guest to inform members of the U.S. Congress of the Soviet side's concern about the existing approach in the United States to the problem of sea-based tactical nuclear arms and the general position of the U.S. Administration regarding naval arms.

Problems arising in connection with the unification of the two German states and also nuclear weapon tests, the development of anti-satellite weapons, and sea-based cruise missiles were discussed.

Holds Discussion With Akhromeyev

LD2803084190 Moscow TASS in English 0811 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 28 TASS—Soviet KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov, member of the USSR Presidential Council, received visiting U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy here on Tuesday [27 March]. They discussed matters of mutual interest.

It was pointed out that there were possibilities for cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States in such areas as action to combat the illegal spread of narcotics, international terrorism and smuggling. Other matters, including the situation in Lithuania, were also discussed.

Senator Kennedy also met Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, member of the Soviet parliament's Committee for Defence and Security Matters. Disarmament issues were discussed.

They exchanged views on factors hindering large-scale cuts in strategic and tactical arms. The Soviet side expressed readiness for bilateral monitoring of the processes of limiting naval delivery vehicles of nuclear weapons. The United States is known to have refused talks on the subject.

Matters concerning the development of Soviet-U.S. scientific and technical contacts were discussed during Kennedy's meeting with Nikolay Laverov, Soviet deputy prime minister and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology.

U.S. Admiral Crowe Interviewed on USSR Visit

LD2703184290 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Interview with former head of Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Crowe at the end of his visit to the USSR, date, place of interview not given—Crowe's remarks are recorded]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The admiral visited the Ukrainian capital Kiev, the southern city of Odessa and the Siberian city of Novosibirsk where he had meetings with the military and scientists, farmers, and workers of defense-orientated plants now under conversion. All of these plants, evacuated to Siberia during World War II, have been working on defense contracts and recently have been declassified. Admiral Crowe:

[Crowe] As far as I could see, and I think the tours and the information we were given was very open, there was nothing withheld—they have now converted a great deal of their capacity to other things and were now open plants. [sentence as heard] This does not mean that they had ceased military production, but had reduced it. In the plants [words indistinct] in Novosibirsk they have for some time now produced artillery shells as well as machinery for textile manufacturing. They have considerably reduced the production of artillery and missile shells and I saw the lines that had been discontinued and had considerably expanded not only in the textile machine making products but a variety of other civilian sector and consumer goods. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] Although he insisted that his was a private visit, his reputation and influence as a military expert made his talks with President Gorbachev, the Soviet defense minister and chief of staff, and President's Aide Marshal Akhromeyev far from private and covered a whole range of bilateral relations. He said he appreciated these discussions which, once again, helped clarify and verify each other's positions. Admiral Crowe outlined his views on naval issues.

[Crowe] The U.S. has global interests, that's why we feel so strongly about our naval forces—how many of these interests, both economic and security, do not concern the bilateral relationship but are outside of that, affect other parts of the world. At the same time I think it should be made clear that naval forces have not been completely outside of these kinds of dialogues. We have had an incidents at sea agreement since 1972, we have had bilteral talks in the law of the sea context, concerning naval forces, and that naval forces have been part of our dangerous military activities agreement as well. I think it's important to understand these things.

[Announcer] However, Marshal Akhromeyev disagrees with the earlier American position expressed by the admiral.

[Akhromeyev in Russian, fading into English translation] Americans have their reasons for justifying the need for a large naval force because the United States is a major naval power. This country is not claiming naval parity and yet, said Marshal Akhromeyev, we think it would be expedient if the United States would view the naval issue not only from and solely in United States interests. Once we live in an interdependent world, he said, we must try to take into account each other's interests. The Soviet Union is doing so in its approach to conventional cuts in Europe and the issue of strategic arms where it stands on a principle of give and take. It is impossible, he said, to resolve issues without mutual concessions and compromise, but he said the same approach has so far been absent on the issue of navies.

[Announcer] It is to be noted that a solution to this problem will emerge sooner or later since the superpowers agree that disarmament is needed, although they are at odds on some weapons types or disarmament aspects. This has also been reaffirmed by Admiral Crowe.

[Crowe] I think that what is more important and what should be concentrated upon is exactly what the two countries are doing, and that is to do some of the fundamental spade work that is necessary to improve the bilateral relationship between our two countries and to work very hard at getting the initial START and conventional forces agreement.

U.S. National Guard Chief on Force Reductions

LD2303133890 Moscow TASS in English 1309 GMT 23 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Stanislev Lunev]

[Text] Washington March 23 TASS—Radical changes in the international situation may result in a reduction of both regular U.S. Armed Forces units and thir reserve units, Chief of the U.S. National Guard Bureau Lieutenant-General John Conaway said.

The National Guard is a major reserve of the American Army and Air Force. In peace-time they are subordinate to state governors.

The Guard is capable of helping local authorities protect the lives of citizens and their property, as well as to maintain peace, order and public security.

During a war, it will help protect U.S. territory. The Guard Army units number 455,000, and Air Force units—155,000.

Service in the National Guard is very popular among young Americans. Many renowned politicians, including Vice-President Dan Quayle, served in the Guard. Three out of five 1985 "Discovery" crew members were pilots in the Guard Air Force.

Conway expressed hope that contacts betwen Soviet and American militaries will involve not only regular forces but the reserve as well. This, to his mind, will contribute to the consolidation of trust and better understanding between the Soviet and American peoples.

U.S. Electoral Group Visits Russian Federation

LD2403233290 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 23 TASS—The results of the Russian Federation's parliamentary elections and preparations for a Congress of People's Deputies of the biggest Soviet republic evoked much interest of members of a delegation from the United States Federal Election Commission. They were recieved by deputy chairman of the Presidium of Russia's Supreme Soviet Tatyana Ivanova today.

The American delegation is on a visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Central Electoral Commission.

The elections in the Russian Federation are virtually over, Ivanova said. She said that elections are still to be held in only 40 constituencies and that a quarter of the number of deputies have been elected for a second term.

She does not go along with the current opinion that the Soviet Communist Party is losing its influence. She said that the majority of deputies in the Russian Federation are Communists. At the same she stressed that the party's responsibility for its activity will grow.

Ivanova admitted that the new Russian parliament faced complex problems. She said that Russia has been adversely affected more than other union republics by the omnipotence of central agencies. At the same time, Ivanova was optimistic about Russia's future. She noted that many competent and benevolent people were elected to the Russian Federation's leading bodies.

Federal Commissioner Lee Ann Elliott told TASS that the chief purpose of the delegation's visit to the Soviet Union is to exchange information on matters related to the electoral systems in the United States and the Soviet Union. She said that members of the Federal Election Commission also wish to see how elections are conducted in the Soviet Union. Lee Ann Elliott said that the meeting at Russia's Supreme Soviet was valuable and necessary.

Venture Planned With U.S. in Electronic Mail

PM2603091990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[S. Lukanina report under the "Contacts—Contracts" rubric: "Electronic Mail"]

[Text] Moscow—The major U.S. communications firm Sprint International together with the Central Telegraph Agency and the Latvian Academy of Sciences Institute of Electronics and Computer Technology is preparing a surprise for businessmen. A preliminary agreement has been signed on the creation of "Telenet USSR"—a Soviet-U.S. venture providing fundamentally new electronic communications services.

"He who controls information controls the world." That aphorism is entirely applicable to Sprint International, whose communications channels cover the globe. Set up 15 years ago to provide international data-transfer services, the firm now provides all kinds of voice and documentary communications services and videoconferencing. The firm operates more than 600 videoconferencing studios—after all, many businessmen prefer not to spend time and money on direct personal meetings.

Now the USSR is joining this global international network: At a time when new economic relations are being established it is important to draw on the sources of world data flows. Although we have not exactly been spoiled for choice—we have not yet grown accustomed to telex and fax machines—we are now being offered the wonder of the age: electronic mail. This is a cheaper, more accurate, and superfast way of transferring information. It takes a telex six minutes to carry 2,400 characters, it takes electronic mail just six seconds.

Mistakes are ruled out. Electronic packages can "carry" anything you like: drawings, sketches, photographs, or newspaper pages. One network can carry different types of information simultaneously to several destinations.

Just what do people, firms, departments, and enterprises interested in such services need? To buy a computer and subscribe to the firm "Telenet USSR."

China

Li Peng Meets Soviet Journalists in Beijing

LD2703132990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1201 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Beijing, 27 Mar (TASS)—Receiving today a delegation of Soviet journalists led by USSR People's Deputy A.N. Shibik, Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, expressed a striving for further developing and deepening many-sided links between China and the Soviet Union.

The head of the Chinese Government said that in the near future, he would make an official visit to the Soviet Union which, he hopes, would promote the further expansion of Soviet-Chinese cooperation in all spheres.

Li Peng told the journalists about the long path China had covered over the 40 years of people's power, its achievements in the economic, social, scientific and technical, cultural, and other spheres. Attention was focussed above all on the latest decade of the implementation in the country of the policy of large-scale reform and openness to the outside world.

The premier of the PRC State Council answered questions from journalists.

'Vremya' Comments on Meeting

LD2703220890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

Today Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, received a delegation from the Union of Journalists of our country.

[Correspondent V. Kulikov] In the conversation with our journalists, Li Peng recounted the achievements of the country which recently marked its 40th anniversary. He especially dwelt on the problems of Chinese reform. In these days sessions of the legislature are being held, at which State Council premier made a speech on the work of the government. Naturally, it is precisely the problems

of the political, economic, and social development of China on which Chinese society is concentrating and which interest representatives of the mass media abroad. Answering questions put by correspondents of TASS, the weekly ZA RUBEZHOM, and the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, Comrade Li Peng recounted the forward development of Chinese-Soviet neighborly relations. He stressed that this corresponds not only to the interests of both countries, but is to the advantage of the cause of peace in Asia and throughout the world.

[Unidentified journalist] Comrade Li Peng, your visit to the Soviet Union is to take place soon. What hopes do you place in that visit?

[Li Peng, in Chinese with superimposed Russian translation] First of all, I would like to convey the friendly feelings of the Chinese people to all Soviet people and express the profound conviction that the peoples of our countries should live in peace and friendship. First of all, during my stay in Moscow, I would like to talk about economic cooperation. If we manage to achieve specific results in this sphere, that would not be bad at all. Naturally, we have in mind to exchange opinions on international issues. And here the main thing is not some kind of specific accords. It is important to get a good idea of each other's stands. [video shows journalists with Li Peng]

Li Peng Discusses Sino-Soviet Relations

OW2203044490 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 21 Mar 90

[Nikolayev Commentray; from the "World Today" program]

[Text] Chinese Premier Li Peng expressed satisfaction with developments in Sino-Soviet relations. In his report to the National People's Congress session in Beijing on 20 March, he stressed that good-neighborly relations between China and the Soviet Union on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence conform to the interests of the two peoples, and are conducive to peace in Asia and in the whole world. Station commentator (Nikolayev) has the following comment:

The Soviet leader agrees with this view. Gorbachev's remarks at a press conference on 15 March attest to this point. On Sino-Soviet relations, he said: We attach great importance to Sino-Soviet relations and will do our best to strengthen such relations. Sino-Soviet relations since the summit meeting at the end of last May have led us to conclude that strict observance of norms governing bilateral contacts is the principle guiding the relationship between the two countries. Moscow and Beijing adopt similar attitudes to each other's internal affairs. The Soviet Union and China have many things in common when it comes to resolving problems pertaining to socialist construction. There are also dissimilarities. Neither country, however, sees this as a reason for dispute or friction. Every country has its own domestic policy and should not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. The exchange of views [between Soviet and Chinese leaders] led to another event. The Sino-Soviet seminar on economic reforms, held in Moscow in February, indicated broad prospects for bilateral cooperation. Agreement reached at the summit in Beijing was not for form's sake. Efforts have been made to implement it gradually by building up mutual trust and seeking new forms of cooperation.

In his report, Premier Li Peng noted the progress made by diplomatic and military personnel of the two countries in border talks. The purpose of the talks is to defuse military confrontation between the two nations in a bid to demilitarize the Sino-Soviet border. Economic cooperation between the two countries has proceeded remarkably. Total trade volume reached 2.4 billion rubles last year. An agreement on further increasing bilateral trade was concluded during a recent trip to China by the Soviet Minister of Foreign Economic Relations. Exchanges between the CPSU and the CPC are also growing with each day. A delegation, headed by Wang Renzhi, director of the CPC Central Committee's Propaganda Department, arrived in Moscow this week. Both countries agree that the potential for cooperation has yet to be tapped fully. The development of such potential requires active efforts in all fields. Both China and the Soviet Union set great store by Premier Li Peng's visit. We hope that the visit will further promote Sino-Soviet relations.

Lebedev Assesses Soviet-Chinese Relations

OW2103011890 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 19 Mar 90

[By station commentator Lebedev]

[Text] A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman spoke to Chinese and foreign reporters at a press conference in Beijing. He said that China will, on the basis of the Five Principles of of Peaceful Coexistence and following the guidelines of the agreement reached at the Soviet-Chinese summit, develop relations with the Soviet Union. Station commentator Lebedev writes:

The Soviet-Chinese summit held last May in Beijing helped completely normalize relations between the two big countries. The anniversary of that meeting is approaching. Soviet and Chinese leaders, in order to put the past behind them and work for the future, to bid farewell to the painful chapter left by history, and to realize the fundamental interests of the two peoples, have shown wisdom, abandoned dogmas, and made wise mutual concessions.

Many major changes in the relations between the two countries have occurred since the summit meeting last year. Both sides have shown the desire to realize the contents of the agreement. The normalization of relations is manifest in the mutual reduction of armed forces, in fostering trust, above all the mutual trust in border areas, which creates favorable conditions for

improving the relations between the two countries. The most ideal thing would be the future demilitarization of Soviet-Chinese borders.

Both sides are adopting the cooperative method of making different levels of exchanges and contacts. Cooperation and exchanges in the area of science, technology, culture, education, and sports have expanded. I want to refer to the economic and trade cooperation between the two countries. Soviet-Chinese trade reached R2.4 billion last year, which represents an increase of 30 percent over 1988. According to the projection of experts, the Soviet Union and China will continuously expand economic and trade ties.

Our country and China have full confidence in expanding bilateral relations. Speaking at a Moscow press conference, Soviet President Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union highly esteems relations with China and will do its best to promote them.

CPC Delegation Continues Visit in USSR

OW2503150890 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 24 Mar 90

[Text] A delegation from the the CPC Central Committee is continuing its visit in the Soviet Union. The delegation is led by Wang Renzhi, member of the the CPC Central Committee and head of its Propaganda Department. The Chinese visitors are currently visiting Leningrad and Kiev.

Earlier, Kapto, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of its Ideological Department, held a meeting with the CPC delegation at the editorial department of PRAVDA. The two sides exchanged views on issues of common interest.

Northeast Asia

ROK Group in Moscow Enroute to DPRK

SK2803005490 Seoul CHOSON ILBO in Korean 28 Mar 90 p 1

[Report by correspondent Hong Chun-ho from Moscow]

[Text] A group made up of members from the ROK delegation led by Kim Yong-sam, co-leader of the Democratic Liberal Party [DLP], now on a visit to the Soviet Union is reported to have left Moscow early on the morning of 28 March to visit Pyongyang for top secret contacts with the North Korean side.

A well-informed source disclosed the news today and said: We cannot disclose who leads the delegation visiting North Korea, nor the specific composition of the delegation, but this delegation has gone to North Korea to contact the North Korean side to explain to them that the fast-moving contact between the ROK and the Soviet Union is not intended to isolate North Korea but was prompted by the thought that it will contribute to the mutually beneficial relations between the North and the South and, ultimately, to the creation of favorable conditions for the reunification of the North and the South.

This source said that he understands that prior to the top secret visit to Pyongyang by this delegation, co-leader Kim Yong-sam had a lengthy consultation by telephone with President No Tae-u in Seoul on the night of 27 March.

It has been revealed that the ROK delegation's visit to North Korea was prompted by such developments as the agreement on party-to-party exchanges between the CPSU and the DLP, and it seems that the Soviet side, on its part, has made behind-the-scenes contact with the North Korean side in connection with this visit to the North by the ROK delegation.

In the meantime, it has been revealed that co-leader Kim Yong-sam reported to President No Tae-u on the telephone the contents of his talks with Gorbachev and other things about his visit to the Soviet Union which have not yet been made public.

Visit to Pyongyang Denied

SK2803022090 Seoul Domestic Service in Korean 0200 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] Yi Su-chong, Chongwadae spokesman, referring to a report that some members of the ROK delegation led by Kim Yong-sam, co-leader of the Democratic Liberal Party [DLP], which visited the Soviet Union, also visited North Korea, stated that the government has not sent any member of the delegation to North Korea. Spokesman Yi Su-chong also denied the report that President No Tae-u and the DLP Co-leader Kim Yong-sam had a telephone conversation.

Gorbachev Sends Reply Letter to ROK Delegation

SK2703030090 Seoul THE KOREA HERALD in English 27 Mar 90 p 1

[Text] Moscow—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev was reported here Monday to have delivered a personal letter to the Korean official delegation now on a week-long visit to the Soviet Union in reply to a letter sent by President No Tae-u through Pak Chol-on, first state minister for political affairs.

Close aides to Kim Yong-sam, co-leader of the ruling DLP [Democratic Liberal Party], said that official negotiations have already started between Seoul and Moscow for the normalization of ties and speculated that President No may visit Moscow sometime later this year.

The letter from Gorbachev, whose content is unknown, may be a partial answer to a host of questions raised in connection with the Korean official delegation's visit to Moscow, they said.

Three possible scenarios for the improvement of ties reportedly under scrutiny by Moscow and Seoul authorities are immediate and full diplomatic relations, talks

both in Seoul and Moscow between south Korean and Soviet cabinet-level officials in the areas of foreign affairs and economy for normalization of relations and handling of all economic matters through the Korea-Soviet economic cooperative councils.

Amidst widespread reports here that more serious negotiations between Seoul and Moscow were under way, Pak Chol-on, first state minister for political affairs, was not seen for a whole day over the weekend touching off fresh speculation about secret talks with high-ranking Soviet officials.

Pak, who delivered No's letter to Gorbachev through Karen Brutents, the first deputy chief of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, March 22, vanished from sight Saturday, which immediately stirred up rumors that he has a secret mission in Moscow.

When pressed to reveal his activities in Moscow by reporters, Pak simply said: "I met with a respectable Soviet official at a respectable place in a courteous atmosphere."

IZVESTIYA Interviews Kim Yong-sam

PM2703113890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Ivanko and Ye. Piskunov report on interview with Kim Yong-sam, cochairman of the Democratic Liberal Party of South Korea, in Moscow: "'Our Relations Must Be Put on a Solid Basis,' Kim Yong-sam, Cochairman of the Democratic Liberal Party of South Korea, Believes"—date of interview not stated]

[Text] Early in the morning this elderly man can be seen in Moscow running at a trot along Dimitrov Street. The 61-year-old Kim Yong-sam is only in the Soviet Union for a few days, but, in spite of a long journey and the time difference, he does not change his habits.

Kim Yong-sam heads the most impressive South Korean delegation that has ever visited our country. He is one of South Korea's leading political and public figures, was not so long ago the leader of the opposition, and is now the cochairman of the ruling Democratic Liberal Party.

Literally every minute of his time in Moscow is accounted for. The telephones in his hotel room never stop ringing. His companions constantly come into the room (about 30 of them have come with Kim Yong-sam: businessmen, ministers, parliamentarians, and various aides and advisers). Nonetheless, Kim Yong-sam deemed it possible to meet with us and answer IZVESTIYA's questions.

[IZVESTIYA] Mr. Kim Yong-sam, what are the main aims of your visit?

[Kim Yong-sam] You straightaway ask such a serious question... For us, the main thing is to define ways of further widening our relations in various spheres between two sovereign states. Our goal is to promote the normalization of relations between the USSR and South Korea. This is why the South Korean media are following the visit so closely. Reports on the course of the talks in Moscow are being printed on the front pages of the papers. [Kim Yong-sam ends]

In spite of the rather negative attitude to the Soviet Union of many South Korean politicians, even some years back Kim Yong-sam was not afraid to express open support for perestroyka in the USSR. This position stems from all Kim Yong-sam's political experience—his voice always sounded a discordant note in the times of the many military dictatorships.

Even in his youth, Kim Yong-sam was expelled from college for his patriotic stance against the Japanese occupiers. Later, graduating from Seoul University and becoming in 1954 the youngest deputy of the South Korean National Assembly, he sharply criticized the authoritarian regimes of Syngman Rhee, Park Chung Hee, and Chon Tu-hwan. He suffered repressions, was tried, imprisoned, threatened with reprisals...

[Kim Yong-sam resumes] In 1979 I was leader of an opposition party, and then an unprecedented incident occurred. Park Chung Hee stripped me of my credentials of deputy, which was unconstitutional. In the city of Pusan (the second largest in South Korea) popular demonstrations against this tyranny began. This led to the fall of Park Chung Hee's regime, but then the next dictator came to power. Under Chon Tu-hwan, I found myself under house arrest. Two battalions of soldiers surrounded my home, and saw to it that I had no contacts with the outside world. [Kim Yong-sam ends]

...From 1980 through 1985, Kim was forbidden to pursue political activities. Protesting human rights violations in South Korea, in 1983 Kim Yong-sam carried out a 23-day hunger strike.

However, the South Korean people's desire for democracy could not be crushed continually. In 1987 Kim Yong-sam was one of the candidates for the post of South Korean president. These were the first democratic elections for 40 years. In them, Kim Yong-sam received 27.5 percent of the votes. He became the second most powerful figure in the country, after the new president, No Tae-u. Realizing that, for the successful development of the country, the consolidation of all democratic forces was necessary, he was one of the initiators of the merger of the three leading parties: two opposition parties and the ruling party. Today, 70 percent of the republic's population are ready to vote for Kim Yong-sam. In the opinion of commentators, his victory chances in the 1992 presidential elections are rather high.

[Kim Yong-sam] I believe that South Korea should take bold, large-scale decisions in the sphere of economic cooperation with the USSR. This is an urgent task. It is not a question of the immediate establishment of diplomatic relations. However, I am sure that it is necessary to put our relations on a firm footing in all spheres.

[IZVESTIYA] The course of the development of relations between the USSR and South Korea will depend in many respects on the dialogue between the DPRK and your republic. How do you rate the prospects for these relations?

[Kim Yong-sam] I well understand that the USSR and the DPRK have long-standing friendly relations. But the DPRK is of fundamental importance for us too. I realize that the Soviet Union cannot avoid reckoning with the existing regime in North Korea. If you follow the situation in the North intently, it is impossible not to notice that one and the same regime has been in power there for 40 years now. And during all those years, its evaluation of world affairs and of the situation in South Korea has not changed. And there is probably no country in the world whose policy has been so inflexible. Yet the governments of sovereign states have to react appropriately to changes in the world.

Recently the DPRK began to speak of the possibility of dialogue between North and South. Contacts began on several levels. But recently they have for some reason ceased through all channels. All the same, the changes which are taking place in Eastern Europe cannot but have an influence on North Korea.

I have information that the DPRK takes a negative view of our visit to Moscow. However, if a complete normalization of relations between the USSR and the Korean Republic takes place, the North will be forced to change its attitude to us, and to the changes taking place in the rest of the world. The basis of South Korea's foreign policy is the maintenance of friendly relations with all countries. Diplomatic relations have been established with a number of states in Eastern Europe. In the future, I hope, we will have embassies in every East European country.

But we regard the development of relations with such states as the USSR and China as especially important. At the end of 1989, trade turnover between South Korea and the PRC totaled $3.1 billion. But with the Soviet Union it was only $600 million. With a surplus of $200 million, moreover, in South Korea's favor. But in future, the volume of trade with the USSR will doubtless increase; at least so one would like to hope...[Kim Yong-sam ends]

Such are the thoughts of Kim Yong-sam. We think our readers are especially interested in the question of the possibility of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea. We do not intend to make predictions, and we will cite only one extract from the transcript of the first press conference of the president of the USSR:

"MBC Television (South Korea): 'Esteemed Mr. President, how do you rate the prospects for establishing diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea?'

"Answer: 'I rate them as good.'"

Radio Moscow Airs Interview of Kim Yong-sam

SK2803012190 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] As has already been mentioned, a delegation of the Democratic Liberal Party, the governing party of the ROK, headed by the party Co-chairman Kim Yong-sam, is on a visit to our country. The delegation came to Moscow at the invitation of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations.

Now, we are going to air an interview President Kim Yong-sam has given to a Radio Moscow reporter.

[Begin recording] [Reporter] Above all, we are very grateful to you for sparing some of your precious time for us at Radio Moscow.

My first question is: Your visit to the Soviet Union is nearing its end. What is your assessment of the visit and of its outcome?

[Kim Yong-sam] My first visit in (?June) last year can be likened to laying a foundation. This time, however, I think we have made, for the first time in 45 years, a great breakthrough of historic proportions for Korean-Soviet relations. I believe it deserves to be greatly appreciated.

[Reporter] What condition do you think relations between our two countries are in?

[Kim] It is my firm belief that the sooner relations between our two countries are normalized, the better it will be for preserving peace in Korea, the Far East, Asia, and in the world at large and the more it will be in our interests. This is because politics and economics are inseparable. It is impossible to conceive of politics as being a separate affair. They should be promoted simultaneously. Only when they are promoted simultaneously can the two countries benefit from each other enormously.

In my view, there is no other choice for the Soviet Union and Korea but to go in that direction. I think it will not only benefit Korea and the Soviet Union, but it will also greatly contribute to ensuring peace between the North and South.

[Reporter] What is your assessment of perestroyka?

[Kim] One cannot expect that all national policies can be enforced successfully so quickly. Perestroyka, I think, is on its way, though slowly, to being realized. Even in the course of promoting perestroyka, the Soviet Union should establish diplomatic relations with countries like South Korea. It will involve not only South Korea, but also other countries. For example, not only South Korea, but also Japan will take part in joint development of Siberia. Such economically powerful nations as Japan, the United States, and Germany will inevitably follow suit. The ROK is being very closely watched by these countries.

[Reporter] As you may know, great changes have taken place in East Europe. (?West Germany) and the GDR are expected to be reunited soon. These are the unexpected changes. Do you think that the ROK and the DPRK can also be reunified as quickly as the Germanys?

[Kim] I briefly mentioned it in my speech at Moscow University. Thanks to such political leaders as Brandt, West Germany has been successful in achieving the prosperity it enjoys today. Brandt is the politician who has played a crucial role in ushering in such prosperity. A few months ago, such changes would have been inconceivable for these politicians. The changes are so sudden. Although the two Germanys remain separate in terms of territory, the people in both sides are already reunified spiritually. People can freely come and go anywhere they choose. They can go anywhere of their own accord—East Germany or West Germany. Given the fact that Germans can go anywhere in the two sides, they are practically and spiritually reunified.

Because of the tragic war fought between the North and South 45 years ago, the two sides still do not trust each other. Therefore, the most important thing for them now is having dialogue between them, (?seeing) each other, and promoting exchange between them—political, material, and humanitarian. Through such exchanges, the two sides should build mutual confidence. In the process of confidence-building, the two sides can start disarmament negotiations. This is, however, difficult to achieve, because of the lack of (?dialogue). The two sides have yet to arrive at a stage where they can restore mutual trust through phased exchanges.

This being the case, it is extremely difficult to compare us with the Germanys. Nevertheless, we have to walk along such a difficult and treacherous road. It is something that we must pursue without interruption.

[Reporter] What kind of attitude do the Korean people have toward the Soviet Union?

[Kim] The Korean people believe that the Soviet Union is as much responsible as the United States for the division of Korea. They also remember that the Soviet Union helped North Korea during the Korean war.

However, it is my belief that we cannot cling to the past indefinitely. For the past few years, when nobody dared to do so, I repeatedly called for establishing diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, in public addresses and press conferences. I repeatedly said that we must support President Gorbachev's perestroyka, his reform policy, arguing that doing so will be in the interest of the world. I also warned against anything that can throw the Soviet Union into turmoil. I was able to say so because I, forgive me for saying so, had support among the people. If it was not me and somebody else who said so, (?he would have been regarded as somebody who is out of his mind).

Now, (?look what happened to me). The Korean people understand me. I was the only person among the Korean people who sent a message of congratulations to President Gorbachev when he became Soviet president. I thought it was wonderful that he had become president of the Soviet Union. I hoped his election would serve as an opportunity to successfully carry out perestroyka.

I am very much satisfied with what has happened in relations with the Soviet Union. I am convinced that there will be great progress in our relations with the Soviet Union. [end recording]

Kim Yong-sam Hints About Ties With Soviet Union

SK2703020890 Seoul YONHAP in English
0144 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 27 (YONHAP)—South Korea and the Soviet Union are to open formal talks on establishment of their diplomatic relations, South Korea's ruling party co-leader Kim Yong-sam hinted Monday.

There is no major obstacle to normalizing ties with Moscow and "various good signs for opening diplomatic relations between the two nations will appear after I return to Seoul," Kim said in a news conference winding up his eight-day Soviet trip.

The Democratic Liberal Party co-leader, who reportedly met with President Mikhail Gorbachev to discuss normalizing ties and economic cooperation, said he had very useful talks with responsible Soviet officials and shared their view that there is no reason to delay establishment of diplomatic ties. He refused to say if the meeting with Gorbachev actually took place.

An aide said Kim will reveal details of his meeting with the Soviet leader, seen as an unprecedented gesture of hospitality to a politician from a nation with which the Soviet Union has no diplomatic ties, just after he departs Moscow.

The Korean Government is to consider whether there is a need to exchange permanent missions as an intermediate step to full diplomatic ties, Kim said, responding to press reports that Seoul and Moscow have agreed in principle to set up permanent missions, in September at the latest, before going to full relations.

Kim and his 11-member official entourage are to depart Moscow Tuesday afternoon for Tokyo on their way back to Seoul.

Korea and the Soviet Union have been moving fast to improve bilateral relations, which have been especially warm in trade and economy in recent years, during Kim's trip. He first visited Moscow last June as an opposition leader in his capacity as head of the now-defunct Reunification Democratic Party.

South Korean Military Program Criticized

LD2703224390 Moscow World Service in English 0610 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] At the end of last week South Korean Defense Minister Yi Sang-hun ordered to take additional measures to modernize the country's armed forces. Here are the details.

As officials from the military establishment hastened to announce, this step is connected with the upcoming withdrawal of 5,000 servicemen from the U.S. contingent stationed in the south of the Korean peninsula. In my view such assertions are just an attempt to mask Seoul's true intention to continue the program for building up its military potential, and here is the reason why: In the first place particular attention is paid to the military training and modern equipment of the South Korean armed forces. With this aim in mind Yi Sang-hun called for revising the structure of military expenditure. In the framework of a new approach to the country's defense budget there are plans to considerably increase allocations for research and design. By the year 2000 these sums will amount to more than seven per cent of military spending. The main effort will be focused on developing sophisticated offensive weapons, submarines, warships, fighter planes and guided missiles, and on providing command posts for the latest computers. At the same time there are plans to reduce auxiliary expenses connected with the upkeep of military facilities and service staff. So this involves another qualitative swing of the arms race and not just a quantitative addition to the South Korean Army.

Secondly, the agreement on reducing the 43,000-strong American military contingent by 5,000 men by the year 1993 was reached during the recent visit to South Korea by Defense Secretary Richard Cheney. The reductions, however, will involve largely the auxiliary personnel. As for the main combat units, their power will remain unchanged, as Richard Cheney said. The decision to modernize armed forces was taken at a time when the extensive joint Team Spirit-90 maneuvers were in progress in South Korea. Despite official attempts to convince public opinion that the present exercises pursued defensive goals, the specificity of their tasks and their scope, the practicing of offensive operations with the involvement of paratroops and aircraft, including nuclear-capable planes, leave no doubt as to the fact that the nature of Team Spirit-90 is actually aggressive and not conducive to easing tensions on the Korean peninsula.

All this is taking place at a time when the process of lowering military confrontation, connected first of all with Soviet peace initiatives, gains momentum in the world. It's time for Seoul to realize at last that disarmament is the only practicable alternative to the efforts to achieve stability in the region.

Academician Frolov on Cooperation With ROK

LD2703092690 Moscow TASS in English 0645 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—South Korea and the Soviet Union have a good basis for broader and deeper scientific and technical cooperation, Konstantin Frolov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the Institute of Mechanical Engineering, told TASS.

He dwelt on the results of meetings between Soviet scientists and members of a South Korean delegation led by Kim Yong-sam, chairman of the ruling Democratic Liberal Party of South Korea. On the delegation were specialists from major research centres, universities, and various firms.

Academician Frolov recalled that an agreement on scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the South Korean Research Council in the field of emerging technologies, new materials and automation was signed in February this year.

South Korea has made great strides in the field of electronic engineering, mechanics and biotechnology, he emphasised. The achievements are successfully applied in industrial production specifically in metallurgy, car-making and the light industry.

During the meetings Soviet and South Korean specialists expressed a readiness to cooperate in all these sectors, he said.

Efforts are to be pooled in the elaboration of a safety programme which is associated with a wide range of problems concerning the safety of nuclear reactors, ecologically safe energy and transport systems.

"In this field we hope primarily to join hands to computerise these systems and to fit them out with technical diagnostics facilities," Frolov pointed out.

"The conversion of some previously secret research organisations is likewise opening up wide possibilities. We can actively cooperate in the field of the emerging technologies," Frolov emphasised. "South Korea is interested in particular in acquiring licences in the Soviet Union for multiple applications in its industry."

He added that the South Korean side had already requested a list of possible research themes for this purpose.

Moscow-Seoul Air Service To Begin 29 Mar

LD2603174990 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] The Soviet Union and South Korea are to start a regular air service between Moscow and Seoul on Thursday. The agreement was reached through direct negotiations between the USSR national airline Aeroflot and the South Korean flag carrier Korean Air.

Aeroflot has decided to add a stopover in Shanghai on the weekly flights after obtaining China's permission for this. Under the agreement Aeroflot is also authorized to fly weekly between Khabarovsk in the Soviet Far East and Singapore via Seoul beginning from the 25th of next month.

Korean Air is to begin weekly flights between Seoul and Moscow on Saturday. Under the accord it has already begun flying over Soviet territory en route to Western Europe.

DPRK Leadership Mobilizes Youth Detachments

PM2303145090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 90 p 3

[First part of own correspondent A. Platkovskiy article: "Tower of Rice and Steel. By Rapid Fighting Methods—to Sociopolitical Immortality"; Second and concluding part of article published in the 27 March issue of the Soviet UNION DAILY REPORT, pages 19-22]

[Text] The hour has struck for the Korean revolution and its leader. Henceforth their mission takes on an extraordinary character: to preserve at all costs, in its original form, what has not withstood the test in other countries. The stakes are too high to build up illusions. This is indicated by the fragments of once unshakable ideological strongholds that fell overnight in the expanses of Eastern Europe.

History is now describing a dizzying pirouette that sometimes looks like "looping the loop." The utmost restraint is required in these troubled times. Only iron muscles and all-conquering will are capable of defending the ideas written in blood on the banners. The DPRK leadership is rousing the people's masses for a sacred struggle.

What is happening here, in the most stable country, which has been declared by its leadership to be the "pattern of socialism"?

Before starting my story, I would like to warn against hasty conclusions. The hotheads are already drawing parallels and predicting a repetition of the "Romanian version." How easy it is to remain a hostage to stereotypes, and how hard to be objective. But the main thing is that there is nothing more demeaning to a people than a lack of trust in its capacity to decide its own fate autonomously.

Pyongyang, 2200 hours—A detachment runs at the pace of a forced march through the deserted streets, past floodlit monuments and buildings where the lights have been put out. The young men and women—they are aged about 20—are dresssed in the paramilitary uniform of fighters of the "rapid fighting brigades."

"Form up, get in line!" the abrupt command rings out. Their faces are purposeful and resolute. They run like trained runners, accustomed to it. Our paths happen to cross at one of the intersections. But the distance between us increases and becomes insuperable.

I know virtually nothing about these youths. Try as I might, it is virtually impossible to get beyond the glossy images, the smiling builders in the journal KOREA. There are things that it is not customary to discuss with foreigners here. You can only guess at them.

Where is this detachment going by night, and where has it come from? Its existence is shrouded in an atmosphere of secrecy. The internal system governing any subunit—a pioneer unit, a neighborhood group—"minbana" [as transliterated], a plant team, a party cell—is not made public. That has been the custom since the days of the anti-Japanese partisan movement, when there were enemies all around. Little has changed since then, except that there are more enemies and they operate more perfidiously.

In the south of the country, annual joint maneuvers by American and South Korean troops have begun. By order of the DPRK Supreme Command, the army, militias, and youth military formations were put on heightened combat readiness. The newspapers write that there could be an attack at any moment. The population is rehearsing actions in response to the air raid warning. Tension is growing.

The "siege situation" is ever-present. That is the main, systemic feature of the processes taking place in the country. Every schoolboy knows that the motherland must become an "impregnable fortress." The question "why?" does not arise.

Imperialism is engaged in a frenzied offensive, trying to put an end to socialism. The attack is now spearheaded against the countries that are most staunch, in revolutionary terms. And first and foremost against the DPRK. Many socialist countries have not withstood the onslaught and have capitulated, falling victim to the conspiracy of imperialist forces and internal counterrevolution. A turbulent wave of revisionism and opportunism of every hue has gripped the ruling parties. They are weakening and abandoning the leading role. Their place is being taken by antisocialist forces which, under imperialist diktat, carry out political coups under the banner of "pluralism and the multiparty system." A market economy is being introduced and exploiters and sharks are springing up. Society is disintegrating before your very eyes, poisoned by individualism and consumerism.

In China they managed to expose the vile intrigues in time, and the army, loyal to the people, suppressed the counterrevolutionary rebellion. In Romania disturbances also grew into rebellion, but it was not suppressed. However, Ceausescu managed to unmask the conspiracy of external forces in his last speech to the people.

Once a week, "foreign" items appear in a special television program. On how the Cuban militias guard the

revolution, on how Chinese young people engage in ideological self-education, on the struggle of blacks and Palestinians for their rights. And at the end, spine-chilling film of fires, disasters, train accidents, plane crashes, bloody carnage in sports stadiums, and devastating frosts in other parts of the world.

But what about the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union?

In the newspapers you can learn about the latest space launch or read brief reports on plenums and elections of new heads of government. The press does not report what is being discussed at Congresses of People's Deputies, how the elections are going, what is set forth in the CPSU Central Committee draft platform, what has become of Zhivkov and Honecker, what ideas A.D. Sakharov fought for. On the other hand, people are very well informed about things like prostitution and drug addiction in the USSR, although the press does not write about it. Obviously there is a special category of news. This is conveyed at meetings by well trained propagandists.

On the basis of my observations, as a result of purposeful efforts an almost incredible situation has been achieved here, whereby people are not in danger of inner conflicts and spiritual torment arising from the improper consumption of information. Information reliably serves the people and their leaders. After all, they are trying, in modest conditions, to build a kind of socialism where "no one has any worries and everyone lives happily." Naturally, this task is only within the powers of very special people. Like the kids from the "rapid fighting brigade."

The party mobilized them on the labor front. In the republic as a whole there are about 2 million of these fighters—young, brave, tough. Every day they work for eight hours, study for eight hours, and rest for eight hours. They live in huts built with their own hands in the places where they are stationed. Nearly everything is the same as in the army. There are titles and distinctions. They are formed into regiments, companies, platoons. They have iron regulation discipline. Ideological health is monitored by commissars, who are responsible for the fighters' readiness to sacrifice their lives for the sake of the motherland and party. They are sent wherever mass heroism is needed. At any moment, if the order is given, they could take up weapons and form a "wall of steel" to defend the leader [vozhd]. The members of youth formations are not burdened with family concerns, since they must devote their youth to the revolution.

The formation of the youth "rapid fighting detachments" was one of the achievements of the DPRK's social modeling policy. Its main aim is steadily to strengthen "monolithic cohesion" on the classical pattern: leader—party—masses. All the able-bodied population, as well as pensioners and children of school age, are integrated in one way or another into the system of grass-roots organizations, which are subdivided according to the nature of the tasks they are charged with. The "strike detachment of party workers" set up 10 years ago, for instance, is called upon to achieve breakthroughs in the construction of particularly important projects—"masterpieces of the party era"—like the Monument to the Ideas of Chuche, the Triumphal Arch, the "1 May" Stadium for 150,000 spectators. Engineering and technical cadres and rural workers have been brought together in special subunits. The most ramified, well-oiled structure is that of the "neighborhood administrative support groups," which are endowed with special powers to monitor everyday relationships.

Merging with a collective to the point of total forgetfulness of self enables a person to acquire "sociopolitical immortality." The truest path to this is party membership. "Immortal sociopolitical life is granted to everyone if, through the party organization, he enters into ideological and organizational unity with the leader—the center of the socipolitical organism—and shares the party's fate," Kim Il-song says in one of his works. Naturally, a bad end awaits anyone who is inclined toward individualism: Separation from the "center" and "sociopolitical death."

You can imagine what truly colossal opportunities are available to the country's leadership in the administration of society. The general line of its development looks like this. In the course of a permanent revolution accompanied by a merciless class struggle, "all members of society are transformed on the model of the working class." This mainly applies to intellectuals and peasants. The workers themselves undergo "revolutionization under the leadership of the combat vanguard—the party." At the same time "intelligentsia-ization" takes place—everyone, without exception, improves his knowledge, up to the level of higher education graduates. In future, with the arrival of the "total victory of socialism," class and other distinctions are eradicated and a homogeneous, unprecedentedly monolithic, highly productive society is formed, capable of resolving the task of building communism.

That is the theory, but what about the practice? It must be admitted that the results thus far achieved enable us to see striking, almost fantastic features of the planned social entity.

Last December the party newspaper NODONG SHINMUN published a photograph of Kim Il-song and Kim Chong-il together with a group of servicemen participating in a congress of youth union army workers. The strong guys and girls, beautifully turned out, are the personification of "unbending soldiers of the revolution." They are surprisingly similar to one another, like peas in a pod. It turns out that they are all triplets. The text under the photograph tells you this. Nine sets of triplets surround the great leader [vozhd] and his son—the dear leader [rukovodite!].

"The birth of a large number of triplets is a sign of the prosperity of the nation," the newspaper says, citing Kim Il-song's remarks on the occasion of this meeting. Some time later a report was published in the press saying that in the last 10 years, at the Pyongyang maternity home alone, 100 sets of triplets have been born, while there have already been three sets in the first two months of this year. The newborn children are given valuable gifts in the name of the country's leadership. For the boys—silver daggers, for the girls—gold rings. They must keep them from generation to generation, like holy relics.

Here in the ancient land of Korea, nothing happens by accident, at variance with the great design. In this connection the question arises: Why triplets, rather than twins or quadruplets? Perhaps the solution lies in the symbol of the "trinity"? Father, mother, son—leader, party, people.

The figure nine—the number of sets of triplets in the photograph—is also intriguing. According to Eastern beliefs, nine is the symbol of the universe, multiplicity in unity, the perfect number that accords with the perfect condition.

Does not this contain a kind of predestination, denoting the formula for an ideal social structure?

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Laos' Phomvihan Writes Article in PRAVDA

PM2203134190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee and chairman of the Lao Council of Ministers: "Thirty-Five Years of Struggle and Labor"]

[Text] The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the slogan of the great Lenin "Proletariat and oppressed peoples of the world, unite!" showed the peoples and the whole world—including the peoples of Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia—the bright new path of struggle against imperialism and colonialism and for national independence.

Ho Chi Minh, outstanding figure in the international communist and workers movement, was the first person to spread Marxist-Leninist ideas in the countries of Indochina. Combining in his activity genuine patriotism and truly proletarian internationalism, he called for a struggle for national independence and socialism.

In 1930 Ho Chi Minh founded the Communist Party of Indochina. This event was a turning point in the revolutionary struggle of the Lao, Vietnamese, and Cambodian peoples. Under the Communist Party's leadership the Lao people's revolutionary struggle entered a new phase. The first party cell was formed in our country in April 1930. In the mid-thirties a Lao section of the Communist Party of Indochina was set up to lead the revolutionary movement in the country.

From 1945 through 1954 during a long and dogged struggle against the Japanese militarists and the French colonizers the Lao section of the Communist Party of Indochina grew and gained strength organizationally, ideologically, and politically, and its prestige and influence constantly grew. Taking account of the revolutionary movement's features and tasks at the new stage, in accordance with the decision of the Second Communist Party of Indochina Congress its Lao Communist members convened a congress at which the Lao People's Party was set up 22 March 1955 (it was renamed the Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] in 1972).

The birth of the LPRP was a highly important landmark, a great historic event, and a powerful boost to the development of the revolutionary movement in Laos. Heading the multinational Lao people's struggle against the aggression of the forces of imperialism and neocolonialism, the LPRP elaborated a correct strategy and tactics. It creatively employed different forms and methods of struggle, combining the nation's strengths with the might of a combat alliance with the Vietnamese and Cambodian peoples and with the support of international progressive forces. Under party leadership full victory was achieved, the obsolete monarchical system was ousted, and the Lao People's Democratic Republic was proclaimed 2 December 1975.

At the time of its complete liberation our country was extremely backward. Moreover, it had suffered severe losses as a result of the destructive war, certain natural disasters, and enemy intrigue. In accordance with the course outlined by the party, the Lao people, strongly developing the traditions of national consensus and patriotism, demonstrating their adherence to the new system and their great selflessness, and utilizing immense help from the fraternal and friendly countries, healed the wounds of war, restored the national economy and took it to a new level, and provided normal living conditions within a short time.

However, the haste, subjectivism, voluntarism, administrative-edict management methods, bureaucratism, and subsidy policy held back the country's socioeconomic development. Summing up the results of the 10-year building of the new society, the Fourth LPRP Congress in 1986 instigated a course of renewing all spheres of society's life, including ideology, the economic structure, the management mechanism, and labor organization.

The main content of the renewal processes in the economic sphere is the use of the principles of Lenin's New Economic Policy as applied to our country's specific conditions. This constitutes long-term and firm reliance on the possibilities afforded by all economic structures and, above all, by state capitalism, diverse forms of ownership, and economic components which differ in scale. All this is aimed at developing production and the

social division of labor, switching from a physical to a commodity-based economy, resolutely rejecting the use of a subsidy mechanism, switching to the use of a new economic mechanism, making extensive use of commodity-money relations, freely developing the sphere of exchange, with the only limit being the framework of the law, expanding the domestic market, and establishing contacts with the world economy. This is also aimed at ensuring the independence of primary components in implementing production and entrepreneurial activity and at executing the principle of the "combination of three interests" (the state, the collective, and the individual) on condition that the safeguarding of working people's rights is the starting point. Our aim is also to expand foreign economic relations and to develop the most varied forms of cooperation with other states.

The renewal of the country's economic life is based on the tasks assumed by the party. At the same time, we attach great importance to questions of developing democracy both in society and in the party itself, we are actively restructuring and enhancing the quality of party leadership and the effectiveness of state management, and we are fostering a proprietorial sense in the people's masses.

The renewal policy has won the people's full support and approval. Along the road toward its implementation we have already achieved impressive initial results. A new step forward has been taken in the sphere of production and entrepreneurial activity, the market has been expanded, and it has been filled with goods. The country's economy has become more flexible and the population's living standard has notably increased.

Laos' economic ties with other states have expanded. After the adoption of the law on foreign investment the country's economy has started receiving investment from abroad.

However, all this is just the beginning. Renewal in Laos is still not comprehensive. The economy is not balanced. There are still unresolved problems in it. Renewal is essentially a complex and intensive process of revolutionary struggle. Summing up the results of what has been achieved so far, we are striving to put a stop to fluctuations and uncertainty in order to deepen transformation processes and improve their effectiveness and comprehensive nature. This question will be part of the agenda for the forthcoming Fifth LPRP Congress.

Looking back on the 35-year road traveled by our party, LPRP members and the entire Lao people feel a sense of unlimited pride in their heroic past and marvelous traditions. We are proud that our party is continually growing stronger and developing organizationally, politically, and ideologically. When it was born the LPRP had scarcely 500 members. Now there are more than 60,000 Communists. The party has traveled the path of intense revolutionary struggle. And despite the fact that there were shortcomings and failings on that path, its strategic course on the whole and its tactics at various stages of its activity have been correct. That is why it was capable of leading the multinational Lao people along the path of victory in the national liberation struggle and is now continuing to head the process of comprehensive transformation.

These transformations are aimed at consolidating, developing, and improving the people's democracy system, which is gradually developing into a socialist system, and also at making an active contribution to the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy, and social progress on our planet.

Analyzing the path of revolutionary struggle we have traveled, the successes achieved, and the shortcomings that still occur, the LPRP has learned a number of valuable lessons—both theoretical and practical.

The party was created in an extremely backward and semifeudal country with a small working class. Most party members are peasants and small landowners. That is why party members need to focus on steadily improving levels of knowledge in the theoretical sphere in order to create a genuinely Marxist-Leninist party and to implement the historic class mission and tasks set by the party under the conditions of a fierce revolutionary struggle. Each Communist must have a good grasp of our country's specifics and features and of modern development trends so as to be able to creatively apply the principles of Marxist-Leninist teaching in practice. To this end the party must work constantly to strengthen patriotic feelings and class awareness and explain the essence of its policy in order to ensure that all cadre workers and ordinary party members firmly follow the ideal and aims of the revolutionary struggle.

At a time when the party is implementing the course of comprehensive renewal we require that it not lose its close links with practice, that it constantly improve and flesh out its policy, and that it ensure its revolutionary and scientific nature. At the same time, it is necessary to step up and enhance the party's prestige and leading role, to change the content and methods of its leadership, to transform and eradicate manifestations of bureaucratism, and to prevent party activity from being reduced to administrative management. It is also necessary to constantly improve party members' moral and professional qualities, to enhance the militancy of grassroots party organizations, to develop intraparty democracy, to simultaneously strengthen discipline, and to ensure party unity in line with the organizational principles and norms of party life.

The party should always maintain and strengthen its close links with the masses. That is the law of its existence and development, a marvelous tradition, a source of strength, and a firm support in all spheres of its activity. That is why the party has always considered work to mobilize, organize, and rally the multinational Lao people into a united front to be one of the most important factors in the success of its work. The party

should resolutely combat any manifestations of bureaucratism or isolation from the people's masses which emerge among employees or party members.

The LPRP has always taken the position that the Lao revolution is an integral part of the world revolutionary process. In its activity it skillfully combines patriotism with internationalism, reliance on the strength of the entire nation with the support of the world's progressive forces, and national interests with class and common human interests, and combats all manifestations of nationalism. The party constantly strengthens the combat unity and particular solidarity between the three parties and countries of Indochina—Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia—develops relations of friendship and all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries, and makes an active contribution to the common cause of struggling for peace, national independence, democracy, and social progress.

In the 35 years of its existence our party has been closely linked with the CPSU not only by dint of common ideals but also because the CPSU's rich experience and the Soviet Union's selfless aid have been exceptionally valuable for the LPRP's revolutionary cause. Solidarity, friendship, and all-around cooperation between Laos and the USSR are a marvelous tradition based on the high revolutionary ideals of our two countries' parties and peoples. Turning today to the glorious historic path traveled by the LPRP, I would like on behalf of the Lao party, government, and multinational people to express sincere gratitude to the party, government, and peoples of the great Soviet Union for the immense friendly help and support given to the Lao revolutionary cause.

I am sure that thanks to the fraternal unity between our two countries and as a result of the transformations in the bilateral cooperation mechanism on the basis of equal rights, efficiency, and mutual advantage—on which an agreement has been reached between our parties' leaders—Lao-Soviet cooperation will develop even more successfully.

The Lao party, government, and people sincerely support the perestroyka processes taking place in the Soviet Union and fully appreciate the difficulties emerging along that path. We firmly believe that the party of the great Lenin and the great creative potential of the heroic Soviet people will undoubtedly overcome all their trials and achieve great successes in implementing perestroyka in their country.

Laos' Economic Problems, New Policy Noted

PM2203160590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Mar 90 Second Edition p 3

[APN correspondent S. Kolosov dispatch specially for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "Lao-Style Renewal. Successes and Difficulties of New Economic Policy"]

[Text] Vientiane—People can get used to anything, especially anything good. I heard that old truth from Pha Bounmeng, the owner of a disco-bar in the center of Vientiane. Young people from the surrounding suburbs gather there in the evenings to relax after work, to sip a Pepsi through a straw or drink a beer, and to dance. The music and the lights bounce rainbow colors around in the gloom, but Bounmeng has no time for this: He is his own accountant, loader, and filing clerk. He is helped by his wife and daughter. Business is quite good, and the owner is thinking of buying a new van. Incidentally, not only this bar but other private restaurants, workshops, stores, and the Lao leadership's new economic policy have proved their worth, the APN correspondent in Vientiane reports for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

"Enterprise was allowed just a few years ago," Bounmeng said, "but I feel like I've been living like this all my life."

Liberalization—that is, relying on the use in the national economy of producers' personal interests, did indeed emerge recently, in 1983. It accelerated considerably following the Fourth Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] Congress in November 1986. The party today celebrates its 35th anniversary. The economic reform has finally started acquiring a legal basis in the form of laws on foreign investment, taxation, and other legislative acts adopted recently.

"Renewal"—as the process is termed in party documents—is not going smoothly: There are too many problems in its way.

The French colonizers once called the Lao Kingdom the "backwoods of the empire" as an excuse for their complete lack of any interest—apart from a purely scientific interest—in that land. Laos has no access to the sea, and a considerable amount of its territory is covered by inaccessible mountains. The consequences of this are natural and seminatural farms dispersed over a huge mountainous territory; difficulties in transporting goods for the national economy; the impossibility of developing industrially the many valuable minerals found in abundance in Laos...

Well, 14 years ago the people's power inherited a hard legacy. But that makes its success all the more impressive. The first success was to eliminate the threat of famine: Since 1985 Laos has been wholly self-sufficient in food. Lao people are also successfully combating illiteracy and tropical disease. However, Laos continues to be a country with one of the world's lowest per capita incomes (around $140 a year). This is prompting the leadership to seek a way out. "Commodity production, funds, and time—that is what we need to create a full-fledged economy," local economic managers say.

Vientiane today is reminiscent of a large construction site. There is not a street where apartments, offices, stores, and banks are not being built or reequipped. That is true of all of Laos today. Bridges across the Ngym [name as transliterated] and Kading Rivers have been built at unprecedented speed, as has Highway No. 99—and all with the help of Soviet specialists. Several other

highways, a hydroelectric power station, bridges, a circus, and a sugar plant are under construction. The capital's central market—the famous "Talat Sao"—is being modernized. The work will cost more than $1 million.

Incidentally, the U.S. dollar is in virtual unlimited use in the local market, along with the kip—the Lao national currency. The dollar shows that, although the population's prosperity is noticeably growing, the kip's purchasing power is falling. Inflation is over 40 percent (in September 1988 there were 500 kips to the dollar, the rate today is 740) and prices are rising. A kilo of rice costs 200 kips, a kilo of tomatoes 800 kips, onions are 1,000 kips, while a kilo of meat costs 1,400 kips. It should not be forgotten that the average wage of workers and employees in the state sector is $12-15.

Recently there has been a reassessment of values in the scale of social priorities. It is now considered most prestigious to work for an international organization or a joint venture. I was told with alarm by Soviet lecturers at the Lao-Soviet Friendship Polytechnic that sooner or later all the highly qualified specialists—power workers, designers, and building workers—are won over by private operators. Wages are higher at their enterprises, and there are greater opportunities for promotion. In that case why should the state pay large sums of money to train specialists?

The period being experienced by the Lao economy could be called a turning point. The first successes have now been achieved, but they will have to be developed and reinforced—and this will have to be done very cautiously so as not to lose the right impetus which has been acquired with such difficulty.

The last LPRP Central Committee Plenum reaffirmed its fidelity to Marxist-Leninist ideals and expressed its resolve to see the transformations through. At the same time, certain negative trends were noted, such as the spread of Western morality among young people, the growth in prostitution, and the reluctance of certain young people to work for the good of society.

Commentary Examines U.S. Statement on Burma

BK2403133390 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Aleksandr Vladimirov commentary: "What Is the United States Trying To Obtain by Criticizing the Myanmar (Burmese) Military Government?"]

[Text] Official circles in Washington have once again criticized the military government in Myanmar [Burma]. This time the subject of criticism is relocation of people from crowded urban areas to rural areas in Myanmar.

U.S. State Department spokesman Richard Boucher has said that such relocation of people—without advance warning or consent—to remote areas where living conditions are difficult amounts to arbitrary interference in the lives and property of the people. According to U.S. observers, the statement was not aimed against human rights violations; rather, it was directed against a political attempt to weaken the opposition to the military regime. It can be acknowledged that the statement may bring slight relief to those who have seen the plight of people living in wards of Yangon [Rangoon] and being relocated to remote areas in Myanmar. However, the issue is viewed differently by different countries.

According to the experience of Southeast Asian countries, government involvement is indispensable in some areas for relocation of people. It would be difficult to comment objectively on the performance of the Myanmar military government without taking into consideration the situation in the country. What others are saying about the developments in Myanmar should be considered. For instance, Chawalit Yongchaiyut, commander in chief of the Thai Army who recently visited Myanmar briefly, approved of the relocation of the poor from Yangon to areas outside the city.

It is quite clear that Washington tried to discredit the Myanmar military regime internationally over the issue of relocation of local people. THE NEW YORK TIMES quotes diplomatic circles as saying that these relocations of people in Myanmar have overtones of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia. Would it be right to compare the Myanmar military government to the Polpotists who killed three million of their own people? One wonders how even the uncompromising people opposed to the Yangon military government would react to such a comparison.

Who are the ones who need to make accusations of connivance of the Myanmar Defense Services in the narcotics industry and manipulation of the May multiparty general elections? Those who are interested in the accusations are those who want to control the political events inside the country and who want to dominate the country, which is at its most complicated, difficult, and crucial stage since World War II.

Regardless of what we think, it appears that somebody in Washington firmly believes that when it comes to the issue of democracy and human rights, he can do no wrong. The latest events—developments in Panama in particular—have shown that other than passing judgment and opinion, Washington is prepared to deploy its armed forces in a foreign country according to its perception of how people in other countries should live. Such a (?direction) would be dangerous. What would happen when the U.S. approach to the Myanmar problem touches the top? [sentence as heard] Such a development will not contribute to an improvement of the political climate in Southeast Asia.

Near East & South Asia

Andreyev on Majlis-Government Controversies

NC2503093890 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 24 Mar 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary]

[Text] Exactly 10 years ago, in March 1980, Majlis elections took place in Iran for the first time. Since then, the Majlis has become one of the bases of the clerical rule which Imam Khomeyni established in Iran. In a commentary on the role of the Majlis in Iran, our commentator writes:

The spirit of Imam Khomeyni continues to rule the Majlis, even 10 months after his death. As we know, the imam was the founder of the current Majlis and most of the representatives are zealously safeguarding his legacy. Exactly ten years ago, during the first elections after the revolution, Khomeyni enthusiastically called on the Iranians to cast their votes neither for the rightists, nor for the leftists, but for Islam. The vast majority of the people took his advice. Thus, instead of pro-Western intellectuals in European suits, the seats of the parliament were occupied by people wearing turbans.

The 270 deputies of the Majlis undertook the duty of initiating legislation in the Islamic Republic of Iran. But it soon became obvious that not all the deputies understood the country's political problems in the same way. For example, the Iranian parliament was unable—because of differences of opinion—to pass bills on land reform, the monopolization of foreign trade, and other important documents. Moreover, when all the opposing political parties were practically removed, differences of opinion in the society led to clashes between the various groupings in the Majlis.

This process was manifested with special clarity after the death of Imam Khomeyni, whose immense power and credibility reduced the extent of existing controversies. Today secret political machinations are taking the form of overt conflicts, and the higher echelons of Iran are hardly hiding their differences of opinion any more.

The main issue under discussion is the continuation of Khomeyni's path and methods. Imam Khomeyni's official pictures still hang on the walls of shops, institutions, and offices. The mass media constantly repeat the slogan of faithfulness to his policy. But actually a secret conflict over Khomeyni's ideas is going on, and even though no great commotion is made about this, nevertheless there can be no doubt that this conflict exists.

The Majlis plays one of the major roles in this conflict. The religious majority in the parliament believes that all the fundamental ideas of the Islamic Revolution should be persistently fulfilled. The supporters of this policy are sure that any trend toward a more moderate policy could get out of control. Renowned Majlis Deputy Ahmad Rahbari believes that both the press and the country's television and cinema are harming revolutionary values and are disseminating reactionary material. Ahmad Rahbari has described these acts as plots and has called on the state authorities to hang the perpetrators. This is the same idea which former Interior Minister 'Ali Akbar Mohtashami expresses. In one of his speeches he said: There are forces in the Majlis today which are trying to deviate from Imam Khomeyni's decrees and are resorting to various means to do this, even corruption.

About 170 of the 270 Majlis deputies are working against the program for economic liberalization which will grant the private enterpreneurs more freedom of action. They are against foreign investment, and against the abolition of state institutions' monopoly. They are doing their best to prevent the implementation of the policy on opening Iran to the outside world and also oppose any changes in Iran's foreign policy.

Thus, the Majlis remains one of the forums of Islamic radicalism in Iran's changing society. At the same time, the government, which is largely formed of technocrats, is calling for a rational leadership of the country after the past ten turbulent years. The government claims that the Islamic system created by Khomeyni allows a review of the imam's decisions, if the time and conditions call for it. Apparently, the current cabinet wants to do away with the most extreme aspects of the Islamic revolution. It is trying gradually to hand over production units to private owners. It wants to change Iran's face and erase the the uncompromising frown of the past years from it.

This kind of policy for compromise gives rise to controversies between the government and the parliament. The first clash between the government and the Majlis came during the debates on the cabinet presented by 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani. After several votes, the Majlis postponed this issue. Matters reached such a point that 'Ali Khamene'i, Iran's religious leader, had to call on the Majlis deputies not to prolong discussions on the new government and to refrain from hostile sentiments when adopting a decision. The cabinet finally received a vote of confidence, but the parliament's mistrust in it was not removed.

The second overt attack on the government came four months ago in connection with the visit to Iran by former Romanian president Nicolae Ceausescu. A great commotion started in the Majlis after the downfall of the despotic regime in Romania. As pointed out by the TEHRAN TIMES, the organ which is close to the president, the cabinet became the target of strong and unrestrained criticism. As a result, Khamene'i once again called for an end to criticism in the executive organs and said that such criticism harms the credibility of these organs. However, it seems that despite the overt efforts to feign unity and accord, the extent of controversy between the Majlis and the government is not decreasing.

Commentary Views Khamene'i's Pardons, Compassion

NC2503152390 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 24 Mar 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] Because of a new year decree issued by Ayatollah Khamene'i, Iran's religious leader, a humanitarian decision was adopted on 119 prisoners in Tehran, Esfahan, Bandar-e 'Abbas, and Gorgan. Some of these prisoners were freed, while others' sentences were reduced.

Our commentator writes: The compassion displayed on the occasion of the new year sets a good example. This step conforms with this festival to mark the rebirth of life. There is no reason to regret that freedom from prisons releases some of the prisoners from the impacts of so-called (?rehabilitation).

Life is the best teacher, especially for those who want to learn from it—those who have been cast into prisons not because of crimes, but because of selfless service in the country's interests. [sentence as heard]

One can say that the compassion the officials showed the prisoners on the new year is extremely small because figures published by organizations defending Iranian and international rights place the number of political prisoners in Iran only in the thousands.

It is not clear which of the prisoners is affected by the decree, and perhaps this number does not include any political prisoners—people who have been accused falsely. But the humanitarian step concerning the prisoners on the new year is an important and basic issue and a heart-warming precedent that can become a good tradition. This tradition manifests a specific change in Iranian society. The [word indistinct] fundamentalists are retreating in the post-war conditions and healthy views and stands are increasing. The ruling circle of clergymen must face this reality. These circles have to determine their role in the new year celebrations in one way or another, even though the traditions of this day have nothing to do with Islamic dogma.

Under such conditions, the confrontation between those who support old and new approaches toward human rights has increased. As we know, Iran's new leaders have undertaken to remove past [word indistinct], but this is not easy to achieve. Conservative forces among the Iranian clergymen are opposing democratic changes and are imposing their control over the people's behavior and thoughts. These people want feudalistic laws and norms to be preserved in Iran. These people reject the appeals by Iran's freedom-seekers to conform Iran's laws with the UN Human Rights Declaration.

However, progress in defending human rights can be seen. Galindo Pohl, UN expert on international law, recently visited Iran. He was invited by the country's leadership because of internal and external criticism of the situation of human rights in Iran. This invitation was the first effort by Tehran to cooperate with the United Nations in such a sensitive field. The visit to Iran by the UN expert on human rights strengthened the stands of those who oppose the imposition of suppression in the country.

At this time of the new year, it is the (?allies) of those forces who are moving toward the true democratization of Iran.

Parliamentarians Complete Visit to North Yemen

PM2703093190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation Visit to YAR"]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by S.A. Niyazov, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, chairman of the Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, paid an official visit to the Yemen Arab Republic [YAR] 21 through 26 March at the invitation of the YAR Legislative Council.

The delegation was received by Colonel 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih, president of the YAR, commander in chief of the armed forces, and general secretary of the General People's Congress.

Meetings were also held with 'Abd-al-Karim al-'Arashi, chairman of the Legislative Council and member of the General People's Congress Standing Committee, and with other YAR leaders.

The Soviet parliamentarians laid a wreath at the national memorial to those who fell in the struggle for the victory of the 26 September 1962 revolution. They toured the country, visited Soviet-North Yemeni cooperation projects, and familiarized themselves with the YAR people's life.

A working meeting was held between delegation members and YAR Legislative Council deputies. During the talks, which were held in a friendly atmosphere, the sides exchanged information on the political and economic situation in their countries and parliamentary practice, and discussed current international and regional problems.

The YAR parliamentarians familiarized the Soviet deputies with the YAR's democratic experience, the results of the elections to the Legislative Council, its activity in various spheres, and the vigorous steps being taken by the leadership of the two Yemeni states to restore Yemeni unity.

The USSR Supreme Soviet members talked about the highly important events in the Soviet state's political and economic life and the results of the work of the Extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and stressed the milestone importance of introducing the

presidency to ensure the effective functioning of the mechanism of socialist people's power which is being renewed.

During the examination of foreign policy questions the Soviet and North Yemeni legislators agreed that the eighties were a turning point in finally overcoming the "cold war" and moving to a new, peaceful period of world development which opens up extensive opportunities for eradicating the nuclear and ecological threats. This has largely been promoted by the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, which has evolved from confrontation to mutual understanding. In the sides' opinions it is important that all states without exception promote the development of positive trends and implement a balanced and responsible policy. And it was stressed that the creation of a comprehensive international security system would allow some funds to be redirected toward the developing countries' needs in the interests of their socioeconomic development. The growing role in international affairs played by the Nonaligned Movement, which has become an important factor in world politics, was noted.

During a discussion on the Near East conflict the sides pointed to the need to find a political solution to that conflict through talks based on justice and respect for peoples' rights to choose their own path of development. The conviction was expressed that a just and comprehensive settlement of the Near East problem is only possible through collective efforts with the participation of all interested parties, including the PLO—the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine. And it was stressed that the Palestinian people should have the right to self-determination and to the creation of their own independent state.

Expressing gratitude for the support given to the just cause of the Arab people of Palestine and the assistance in solving other Arab problems, the North Yemeni representatives noted the importance of the USSR's initiatives in establishing peace in the region. The Soviet Union's decision to transform the PLO office in Moscow into the Palestinian Embassy is, in their opinion, new confirmation of the friendly Soviet people's unswerving solidarity with the Palestinians' courageous struggle to end the Israeli occupation.

The Soviet and YAR parliamentarians expressed profound concern in connection with Israel's plans to settle Soviet Jews in the occupied Arab territories. In the sides' opinion, such actions are liable to lead to an escalation of tension, a growth in confrontation and extremism, and unpredictable consequences for peace and stability in the region.

The USSR people's deputies made a high assessment of the YAR's position on current international problems, including the problem of a Near East settlement. They stressed that people in the Soviet Union are following the development of the situation in the inter-Yemeni arena with great attention and advocated the constructive development of dialogue to restore Yemeni unity in line with the interests of the Yemeni people's progress and prosperity and the strengthening of peace and stability on the Arabian Peninsula.

During the discussion of bilateral relations it was noted that they are based on the sound traditions of mutual understanding, respect, and noninterference in each other's affairs enshrined in the 1984 Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, which was signed during the YAR president's visit to the Soviet Union. The sides noted the existence of opportunities for improving the entire range of USSR-YAR relations and for deepening them in both countries' interests.

The Soviet and North Yemeni legislators expressed the conviction that contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the YAR Legislative Council will make a positive contribution to the development of Soviet-North Yemeni relations and accord with the interests of both friendly states. The current visit by the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation will promote the strengthening of existing ties between the two countries' legislative organs.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation expressed gratitude for the cordiality and hospitality accorded it during its stay in the YAR, and invited a Legislative Council delegation to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. The dates for the visit will be agreed at some future point.

Arbatov Discusses Arab Relations, Detente

JN2403211590 Kuwait AL-ANBA' in Arabic 23 Mar 90 p 25

[Interview with Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and director of the United States of America and Canada Institute, by Salam Musafir in Moscow; date not given]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Musafir] How do you assess the prospects for Arab-Soviet relations against the backdrop of perestroyka?

[Arbatov] You are aware that President Mikhail Gorbachev, in his recent speech, stressed the need for reactivating Soviet efforts in the region. I believe there are new elements to this historic opportunity. We maintain longstanding good ties with the Arab states that date back to the era of Arab struggle against colonialism and for independence which, as is known, was won with our support. During the cold war, Soviet-Arab relations developed within the context of a common enemy. This era is approaching its demise. Arab-Soviet relations are now based not so much on this common enemy but rather on a recognition of mutual interests in bilateral and global areas. It is no exaggeration to say that a small country like Kuwait—given its strategic location in a volatile region, and its rich natural resources and political tradition—now plays a major role on the world scene. Soviet interests in the region, therefore, are founded on firm bases. I think that the Arab states also

want to have good relations with the USSR as an element of global equilibrium. Throughout the history of Arab-Soviet relations in general and Soviet-Kuwaiti relations in particular, there have not been any serious problems. The Soviet Union has sought and continues to seek to be a force for stability in the region and the world.

[Musafir] The general impression is that since the important shifts in Soviet policies, Moscow has turned its back on its traditional friends. Some say the USSR has struck a deal with the West and the United States to the detriment of developing nations. What is your reaction?

[Arbatov] There are certain forces that have vested interests in maintaining the cold war between the superpowers. This reminds me of a pre-World War I Yugoslav politician who was reported to have said that if it took a world war to boil an egg over its fire, he would be prepared to start one.

In the present-day world also, there are shortsighted people with sordid motives who want to rekindle the cold war between the superpowers. I do not think we should pay much attention to those who want to trigger the cold war. We need to explain our foreign policy to well-intentioned circles who argue that the Soviet Union has turned its back on them.

The Soviet Union is moved by the indisputable fact that we face the common threat of nuclear terror. Over the past few years, Moscow has come up with an unquestionably historic initiative based on detente and the desire to spare the world a nuclear catastrophe. A good many countries, East and West, including Arab states, have had a role to play in firming up the foundations of the new thinking in world politics. We pride ourselves on the fact that it was our country that initiated this trend.

As you know, there has been a longstanding, sanguinary conflict in the Middle East. If the conflict there should erupt into an explosion, it would produce a world nuclear catastrophe. The Middle East is of vital economic and strategic interest to the West and the United States and the USSR. Our country has also common borders with the Middle East and so any mistake could lead to a world disaster.

I would like to state clearly that we struck no deal with the West at the expense of any party. We are fully convinced that no one stands to gain from the cold war and arms race. Even if certain circles in the United States and in the West should decide to revert to the cold war, we will not allow ourselves to be dragged into it. Just as in a tango, the cold war takes two partners. If one of the two partners should decide to cease dancing, it would end. We are now irrevocably committed to this line. It seems to us that the other party is coming round to our position. For all the vast U.S. resources, it has realized that the arms race started by President Ronald Reagan has encumbered it with heavy debts. The common interests of the two sides now require that both avoid the arms race and instead address their internal problems. More than at any time in the past, world nations are well advised to focus on education, health, and cultural and scientific concerns, and disarm and cease the production of weapons of wholesale destruction and divert resources for their well-being.

I would like to stress that our relations with the Arabs are founded on principled and abiding bases. We stand for an equitable, overall solution to the Middle East problem that would ensure the evacuation of the occupied Arab land and the establishment of a Palestinian state. We wish our Arab friends progress and prosperity.

[Musafir] Prior to the thaw in U.S.-USSR relations, you and your institute had argued that the American industrial-military complex was the major obstacle to detente. Now with detente between the superpowers at an advanced stage, how do you assess the role of this complex?

[Arbatov] That is an important question. The industrial-military complex is still in place. As you have rightly pointed out, I had been the leading critic of its obstructionist role in detente. Now, I criticize the Soviet industrial-military complex which includes anti-detente people. The role of the American industrial-military complex has not ended, and hence the slow pace of the U.S. movement toward disarmament. [passage omitted]

India's Troop Pullout From Sri Lanka Viewed

BK2403152590 Moscow International Service in Tamil 1400 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Vadim Menikov commentary]

[Text] Per the announcement of the Sri Lankan Defense Ministry, the last batch of Indian troops are returning home from Sri Lanka. Our commentator Vadim Menikov writes:

Thanks to the combined efforts of the Sri Lankan central government and the Indian leaders, a very pertinent issue has been resolved. The issue of the presence of Indian troops in Sri Lanka created strained relations between the two neighboring countries. The path toward a solution to this issue was not smooth, but the relentless efforts of the two sides (?in the spirit of) bilateral agreements yielded good results. There is no doubt that this resulted in bolstering the honor and prestige of the two countries internally and externally and strengthening the confidence of their people in them. We are of the opinion that at present this bears special significance toward a solution to the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka.

We can say that after the withdrawal of the Indian troops and the dissolution of the Eelam People's Revolutionary Liberation Front [government], which was leading the Northeastern Provincial Council, some sort of political lacuna had been created in the Northeastern Province. Now this vacuum has been expeditiously filled by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelem. But it is clear that the replacement of one group by another in administration

will not solve the problem. The Northeastern Province is inhabited by not only the Tamils but Sinhalese and other communities as well.

Needless to say, the people of the province should decide as to who has the capacity to administer the province. They themselves can decide the issues concerning the future of the province. It is not possible now to categorically predict the future of this province. We think that political negotiations between all the political parties and groups of the province will be best. The sad experience of the nine-year-old ethnic conflict should be taken into consideration here. It is clear that durable peace can be achieved only when the rights and the just demands of all the communities are given due consideration. The central government, which has influence amid the parties concerned, may play a vital role in making arrangements for such political negotiations.

We would like to say a few words about the prospects for the improvement of relations between Sri Lanka and India. It is an undeniable fact that the two neighboring countries are bound by traditional cultural and economic ties. Mutual (?affinity) and respect existed in political relations between the two countries for a long time. To a certain extent, the presence of the Indian troops in Sri Lanka retarded the growth of these relations. Now this problem has been solved.

At present, the proposal to finalize the India-Sri Lanka friendship treaty has again been put forward. Such a proposal was made several months ago. During his election campaign, President Ranasinghe Premadasa said that Sri Lanka would like to finalize a treaty of friendship and cooperation with India like the one India has with the Soviet Union. This view has been welcomed by the new Indian Government led by V.P. Singh. After the withdrawal of the Indian troops, the door for finalizing such a treaty is open. This treaty is significant not only in the context of bilateral relations but also at the regional level. There is no doubt that this treaty will exercise favorable influence on the political situation in South Asia.

USSR-Morocco Culture-Science Pact Signed

LD2503045190 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 23 TASS—A programme for the implementation of the Soviet-Moroccan agreement on cultural and scientific cooperation in 1990-1992 was signed here today.

The document envisages further development of bilateral relations in the fields of culture, arts, science, education, information, and sports.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Holds Talks With Nigeria's Lukman

PM2803102090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading "Visit Completed"]

[Text] Lagos, 26 Mar—Talks have taken place between E.A. Shevardnadze and Nigerian Foreign Minister R. Lukman. A joint survey of a broad spectrum of problems determining the character and dynamics of global and regional development was carried out. It was noted with satisfaction that the general thawing of the international climate is opening the way to the resolution even of those questions which earlier seemed to be deadlocked.

Certain concrete aspects of bilateral Soviet-Nigerian relations in various spheres were touched upon, from the angle of mutual interest in filling these relations with fruitful content for the benefit of the Soviet and Nigerian peoples and for the sake of rapprochement between the countries and continents.

The ministers began detailed work on preparing for the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and I. Babangida. A package of accords that could be developed by the time of the top-level meeting was discussed. The meeting will undoubtedly be a historic event in Soviet-Nigerian relations.

A joint communique on the results of E.A. Shevardnadze's visit to Lagos was adopted.

Official Discusses Lusaka Mandela Talks

MB1803100090 Moscow in Zulu to Southern Africa 1930 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] A delegation of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Asian and African Countries recently [words indistinct] Nelson Mandela. Among them was (Vasiliy Solodovnikov), deputy chairman of the committee. Today he will tell us about his meeting with Nelson Mandela, the renowned ANC [African National Congress] leader:

[Begin (Solodovnikov) recording in Russian fading into Zulu translation] In Lusaka a phenomenal welcome was given to Nelson Mandela, this leader of the ANC. There is no need to enumerate all who were present. Suffice it to instead name those that did not send representatives, such as Margaret Thatcher. Heads of delegations greeted Mandela when he alighted from his plane. On hearing that I represented the Soviet Union, Mandela extended heart-felt thanks to all the peoples of the Soviet Union and its government for assistance which has spanned a number of years in the black struggle against apartheid in South Africa.

As is now known, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has on behalf of the government invited Nelson Mandela to visit the Soviet Union. The invitation was received with

great joy. The date for the visit has not yet been determined, due to the heavy agenda currently facing the ANC in South Africa, but there is no doubt that the visit will take place.

I knew many prominent political figures of the African Continent first hand, such as Amilcar Cabral, Kwame Nkuruma, Kenneth Kaunda, and many others, and have portraits of them in my home. A portrait of Nelson Mandela taken at the residence of the Soviet ambassador in Lusaka now appears among them.

Even after 27 years in prison, Nelson Mandela is still a sincere and principled man. Talking with him was a wonderful experience. He is very intelligent and is well versed on international issues, including events in the Soviet Union, which we discussed at length. When we discussed South Africa we concluded that it was not yet time to establish relations with that country. Mr. Mandela once again noted his appreciation for the Soviet people's solidarity with his people's struggle and the Soviet Union's contribution to the campaign for his release.

Nelson Mandela's appointment in Lusaka as the deputy president of the ANC received the approval of many political organizations within South African organizations and will help smooth the way for a negotiated settlement in South Africa. [end recording]

CPSU Delegation Sets Off on Visit to Zambia

PM2703112790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A delegation of CPSU party officials, headed by Yu. Azarov, secretary of Krasnodar CPSU Kray Committee, has left for Lusaka at the invitation of the United National Independence Party.

East Europe

Soviet Government Issues Statement on GDR

LD2703143490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1234 GMT 27 Mar 90

["Soviet Government Statement"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS)—Here follows the full text of a Soviet Government statement:

"In connection with the GDR Government's statement of 1 March 1990 concerning issues of property in the GDR, the Soviet Government considers it essential to state the following:

"The declaration of Germany's defeat of 5 June 1945 and the Potsdam agreement of 2 August 1945 envisaged the adoption of a program of measures to eradicate German militarism and Nazism, and to democratize political life so that never again would Germany threaten her neighbors or the maintenance of peace throughout the world. Decisions were made to hand over all of Germany's military industry to the four allied powers and to punish war criminals, and also to decentralize the economy so as to destroy the excessive concentration of economic power that had previously existed.

On the basis of these decisions, the Allied Control Council in Germany passed a number of decisions in the course of 1945-46, including Law No. 9 of 20 November 1945 "On the Confiscation of Property Belonging to the Joint Stock Company 'I.G. Farbenindustrie' and on Control Over It" and Law No. 10 of 20 December 1945 "On Punishing Persons Guilty of War Crimes and of Crimes Against Peace and Against Humanity," which among other things provided for the confiscation of the property of such people.

By way of implementing these decisions, the Soviet Military Administration in Germany (SMAG) sequestrated the property of Nazi criminals of the fascist state, and of German military establishments, and confiscated the property of the National Socialist Party.

In the spring of 1946, this property and enterprises were by order of SMAG handed over to the local bodies of German self-government.

On 30 June 1946, a law was adopted by nationwide referendum in the land of Saxony declaring the expropriation of the property of Nazis and war criminals and its transfer to the ownership of the people. Taking part in the vote were 93.7 percent of the adult population, 82.42 percent of whom declared themselves in favor of the law. In 1946-1947 these decisions were backed by the population of the entire Soviet occupation zone, and the administrations of the other lands and provinces issued similar decisions. By August 1946 a total of 9,281 enterprises were transferrred to the ownership of the people.

This property constituted the basis of the national state sector in East Germany. Subsequently, right up until the end of 1953, a large number of enterprises were handed over to the people of the GDR, enterprises that were Soviet property, in accordance with the instructions of the then occupying forces, including a number of industrial enterprises that had passed to the USSR in payment of reparations on the basis of the decisions of the Potsdam Conference.

In accordance with the aims of the Potsdam agreement, agrarian reform was carried out by the land authorities in eastern Germany in 1945, with the agreement of the Soviet military administration and at the demand of the laboring peasants masses. In the course of this reform the foundation of the reactionary Prussian Junker regime was wiped out, and 2,852,000 hectares of land—all owned by war criminals—were confiscated in 1945-46, along with estates of over 100 hectares belonging to big

landowners. This made it possible to hand land over to peasants having little or no land, to migrants, and to publicly-owned estates.

It should be stressed that the Soviet side informed the Allied Control Council, while it still existed, about the carrying out of all the measures to democratize property in eastern Germany, and the Control Council took cognizance of this information.

Insofar as these measures were carried out within the framework of the program for demilitarization and de-Nazification of Germany and decartelization of the country's economy, they were of fundamental importance in the process of creating anti-fascist democratic structures on the territory of what is today the GDR.

Mindful of its rights and responsibilities in German affairs, the Soviet Union is in favor of observance of the legality of ownership relations in the GDR, and is against attempts to place in question property relations in the GDR in the event of a monetary union and economic community being established with the FRG, or in the event of a united Germany coming about. This presupposes that both German states, during the process of their rapprochement and unification, will proceed from the legality of measures in the area of economics that were implemented during the years 1945-49 by the Soviet military administration in Germany. Attempts to dispute the rights of the current owners of land and other property in the GDR, acquired at one time with the agreement of or by decision of the Soviet side, and guided in doing so by the declaration of German defeat, the Potsdam agreement, and other quadripartite decisions and resolutions, would, if they were to take place, be totally unacceptable.

On this issue the Soviet Government shares the position of the GDR Government on the need for strict observance of law and order and the protection of the socio-economic rights and interests of millions of people in the GDR." [quotation marks as received]

Withdrawal of GDR Treason Charges Noted

PM2703120190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Charges Partially Withdrawn"]

[Text] Berlin, 26 Mar—The charges brought against the former members of the GDR's party and state leadership, E. Honecker, E. Mielke, G. Mittag, and J. Herrmann, of high treason and cobbling together anticonstitutional groupings were not substantiated during the investigation. This was announced by the GDR General Prosecutor's Office Press Department, which noted that the charges have been withdrawn on the points in question.

Without doubt, the General Prosecutor's Office report indicates, there were infringements of the Constitution in the past; however, they were prompted by the Stalinist idea of the leading role of the party and the entire former system. This cannot in fact be regarded as high treason. Irrespective of this, the general prosecutor intends to set out the facts which attest to infringements of the constitution and put the relevant documents at the disposal of the GDR Volkskammer.

At the same time charges relating to other crimes and petty offenses committed by Honecker, Mielke, and Mittag were substantiated. Thus, E. Honecker is incriminated in the abuse of trust in the form of considerable expenditure of state funds, in particular for the construction of recreational facilities, andprivileges relating to the supply and personal use of government aircraft. With regard to the case against G. Mittag, an investigation is continuing into the charge of expenditure of state funds on the construction and extension of his country home.

E. Mielke is charged with issuing orders during the 7-8 October demonstrations which entailed a violation of citizens' personal freedom. He is also incriminated in ordering telephone taps and security personnel confiscations of valuables sent by post, which is qualified as theft and abuse of power. Another charge concerns his failure to take steps following citizens' complaints about the rigging of last year's 7 May election.

The prosecutor's office report says that, in view of the scale of the investigation and the medical findings regarding the state of health of those under investigation, some of whom are not fit to be interrogated, the investigation cannot be completed at this time. Steps taken to freeze deposits and sequestrate property and land belonging to the accused are still in force.

The general prosecutor has decided to close the investigation into J. Herrmann's case—he was charged solely with high treason by violating freedom of the press—and release him.

TV Viewers Question East European Developments

LD2203013190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service at 1645 GMT on 20 March broadcasts live a 75-minute program entitled "Where Is East Europe Going?" The program is moderated by Viktor Iliyich Lyubovtsev, with the participation of Vladimir Petrovich Lukin, head of the analysis and forecasting group of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, responsible worker of the CPSU Central Committee; Aleksandr Dmitriyevich Nekipelov, deputy director of the Institute of the Economics of the World Socialist System of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Yevgeniy Arshakovich Ambartsumov, head of the department of the same institute.

Phoned-in questions are received, as are questions from a group of undergraduate and post-graduate students at Moscow State University, where a camera has been set up. Lyubovtsev stresses that the participants are expressing their personal points of view and are not

speaking in their official capacities. [video shows the men in the studio with occasional cuts to the Moscow University room]

Lyubovtsev says: "Here is the first question. What was it that caused the radical changes which have taken in place in our friends' and neighbors' countries? I propose that each of the participants in the program give his reply, his version of the answer to this question, and should set out, preferably briefly, his opinion. Perhaps we should start alphabetically. Yevgeniy Arshakovich, please."

Ambartsumov responds that he believes that the basis of these changes—the collapse of the totalitarian system which predominated in those countries—lay in the fact that the system was contrary to people's interests. "Such a totalitarian system simply cannot exist for any long period in our time." He adds that this system was imposed on these peoples, to some extent from outside, by Stalinism, and to some extent from within, because many of the leaders of those countries were "relayers" who introduced this system into their own countries. Ambartsumov says: "Finally, of course, in conditions of the relaxation of tension, in conditions of the increasing democratization of our society, thanks to perestroyka ... this end was natural, although few supposed that it would be so rapid and so crushing."

Nekipelov is the next to respond, concurring with Ambartsumov, adding that the system was in such deep crises that even those who saw this crisis were unable to foresee with what intensity it would develop under the new conditions. But the fact is that "many of the countries of East Europe are seeking a way out of this crisis outside the framework of socialism."

Lukin says: "It is difficult to disagree with that... If one talks of the problems within the system then... Stalinism bears vast responsiblity." As for the "basis" of the problem, Lukin says he disagrees with the idea that "everything was totally imposed either externally or internally." He speaks of a temptation shared by certain strata of the working people in all the postwar period to "immediately and by relatively simple paths to arrive at a bright future. Command and adminstrative systems were thus constructed "by which it was first necessary to build heavy industry, and then the whole cycle, by incredible efforts. We in effect proposed—to put it mildly, or else imposed—this system on them." In these "pocket-sized contries", the "point of absurdity" was reached early. But leaders of the time said there were enough energy resources, enough of everything—"just build and everything will be in order forever. Thus, Stalinism, its structure and its concept, even at the economic level bore great responsibility for this."

"Of course, we proposed our interpretation of socialism which I would say, in order to abolish exploitation of man by man sharply intensifies the oppression of man by man, and moral oppression of people's will and consciousness, and turns people into cogs and so on. All of this led to the collapse, of course."

Shishlin speaks next, remarking how actutely the political scenery has now changed. He says "the artificial political climate ceased to exist in connection with the restructuring process in the Soviet Union, and the internal contradictions exploded."

Lyubovtsev asks the next question: "Have there been achievements, social and economic achievements, in these countries, in our allied countries?"

Lukin replies: "There have been achievements, but when people in those countries compare the achievements which have occured with what has happened in neighboring countries, that creates a dispiriting impression. Even, say, Czechoslovakia—I mean the Czech lands—which was an immeasurably more developed country than, say, its Austrian neighbor, has ended up immeasurably less developed. It has become what is now called the industrial museum of Europe, with extremely obsolete equipment and on the verge of a sharp drop in the standard of living, because labor productivity has dropped sharply. In other words, these achievements cannot be interpreted as achievements against the background of what is happening next door, and the people can understand and see that."

Lyubovtsev reads out two questions from viewers for Ambartsumov: "Comrade (Tolpinskiy) from Gorkiy asks whether the failure of so-called socialism in the countries of East Europe means its collapse in our country, as a consequence of the dogmatically interpreted teaching of Marx. Here is a question dictated by telephone today by Konstantin Yakovlevich (Alekseyev), a CPSU member since 1951, who calls himself a cameraman at the "Gorkiy" film studio. He asked this, roughly: Is hatred for communism in the socialist countries of East Europe caused by the fact that we in the Soviet Union are incessantly unmasking and continuing to unmask Stalin's crimes?"

Ambartsumov responds: "Above all, there certainly is a failure of socialism, but in a certain understanding of it—the failure, strictly speaking, of the totalitarian model of socialism, the failure of Stalinism or the transformed, somewhat patched-up, improved and touched-up Stalinism in the form of the Brezhnev model. There were likenesses of that model, even in the external appearance of those elderly leaders who went about embracing each other and, so to speak, visibly embodied decay and provoked the indignation and ridicule of their citizens."

Ambartsumov refers to the August 1968 "intervention" in Czechoslovakia: "At that very moment, unfortunately, our country and system became the most hated in the eyes of the Czechoslovak people, and at that time there could not be any talk of any condemnation of Stalin. Many people there—in any event, a good half of the population—knew fairly well what Stalinism brought

with it, so I think that criticism of Stalinism is an element of the process which began significantly earlier in those countries: I mean the Prague Spring of 1968, and events in other countries—in Poland or Hungary in 1956, say."

Lukin replies to a request from a viewer to predict how things will appear in 20 years by making a few general remarks on the nature of a forecaster's lot and some vague observations on current processes.

Shishlin takes up an invitation to answer viewers' questions addressed to him: "Comrade (Romancheyev), an economist from Dnepropetrovsk, asks whether all this perestroyka connected with the socialist countries will be the start of a third world war. I think that it is just the changes which are going on in East Europe now..."

Lukin interjects: "Excuse me, Nikolay Vladimirovich, I also have the same question—will the processes in East Europe now lead to the frontiers of 1937?"

Shishlin continues: "I think that it is both the changes in East Europe and the processes developing now in the framework of an integral Europe and in international relations which convince us that we are indeed on the threshold of a new, truly peaceful period in international relations. The revolutionary changes in the East European countries benefit this process; they will stimulate the development of the process."

Shislin relates a question from Ivan Grigoryevich (Budenets) in Vitebsk: What effect will the Christian Democrats' victory in the GDR have for the USSR? "I think that this subject is broader than the Christian Democrats' victory, and probably all the participants in this program will contribute their mite to the discussion on what will happen. I feel that, in itself, the result of the elections in the GDR looks slightly unexpected, since until the voters went to the polls it was thought that the Social Democrats were in the lead. However, the level of activity of the Christian Democrats and the forces affiliated with them enabled them to considerably overtake both the Social Democrats and the PDS.

"But it's early yet, although it is obvious that it is a success for the West German Christian Democrats, caused by the fact that voters in the GDR believe that the party capable of implementing the unification of Germany at an accelerated pace is, specifically, the CDU/CSU, and they believe that the party which has the greatest resources at its disposal is, again, the CDU/CSU party. Does this mean that the unified Germany of tomorrow will be formed and stuck together by the results of the elections of 18 March? Yes and no, because the actual process of the unification of Germany cannot and will not proceed in some kind of vacuum. The position of the four great powers and the legitimate interests and security of Germany's neighbors have to be taken into consideration. A mass of quantities need to be taken into account, and I feel that a certain time will pass until the unification of Germany, a time of very great and complex political, diplomatic, and other work."

Lyubovtsev thanks Shishlin and changes the subject: "We have not yet touched on the questions of our country's economic cooperation with East Europe, the topic of the CMEA." He offers the floor to Nekipelov, whom he says has already received many economic questions.

Nekipelov says: "The first question touches on a slightly formal aspect of the issue. Sergey (Dagerov) from Kishinev asks whether the change in the names of the East European countries will have an effect on our trade and economic ties. I believe that very many things will have an effect on our mutual ties, and the change of names is the least of them."

Another question concerns how the Soviet Union's economic interests will be maintained in interaction with the countries of East Europe. He responds: "I can tell you that this is a very important question, because we must not approach the problem of our interests in general, and our economic interests in particular, in a static manner. We are now at a stage of the development of our mutual relations where all countries, including the Soviet Union, are reinterpreting their interests, including their interests regarding mutual cooperation. Many issues which seemed to have been solved long ago are on the agenda. The answer to the question whether or not we shall continue with the policy of mutual integration is not at all clear now. In any event, it is clear that we shall approach the development of these processes—I mean all the countries—from the position of economic interests. In general, this has already begun to be displayed in the activity of the CMEA."

Nekipelov reads a question from (Yermoshenko) from Moscow: How will Soviet trade relations with the former socialist countries be built now, and will the CMEA be preserved? "The question whether the CMEA would be preserved was, specifically, the key one at the 45th CMEA session. The whole of that session was characterized by the issue of whether the CMEA would be preserved."

Lyubovtsev interjects: "But, in general, it answered that question in the affirmative."

Nekipelov continues: "Yes, it did answer in the affirmative, although we know that Czechoslovak Finance Minister Klaus made a statement before the session on the possibility of Czechoslovakia's withdrawal from the CMEA, and there was other talk on that subject. In my view, to answer the question briefly, it needs to be said that, if the talk regarding the CMEA is cleansed of its exclusively emotional and political aspects, a sober analysis probably shows that everybody, especially our partners, needs the CMEA now; and we need it to ensure that the dismantling of the old structures of mutual cooperation takes place gradually, because an abrupt dismantling might lead to very unfavorable and serious consequences, both economic and social, for our partners."

Lyubovtsev adds: "Forgive me, it probably should be said, simply, that the share of the East European CMEA

countries in our trade turnover amounts to approximately R65 billion. That is an enormous figure."

Nekipelov concurs: "Yes, 60 percent. It is an enormous figure. In general, the problem is also that, on the one hand, our partners have considerable ties with the Soviet Union, including supplies of fuel and raw materials. But what is even more important, and something which is not always sufficiently well understood by everybody, is that a very significant proportion of those countries' economies is orientated towards the Soviet Union. However unpleasant it is for us to admit it now, we have to say that a significant proportion of that output either cannot be sold in another place, in other markets, or else only under sharply worsened conditions. For that reason, the problems of perestroyka, the problems of transition of cooperation to the micro-level, this is a very serious problem, a problem which affects the interests of countries, and it has to be approached in a very considered and calm way".

Lyubovtsev passes over to Moscow State University, where the presenter says the "Dialog" group, a forum which deals with various sociopolitical problems, has gathered. A man who later introduces himself as A.P. Korabenko, a lecturer and chairman of the group asks: "Did the leaders of the country know, did the scientists know, how events would develop? Do they have any forecast of the possible development of events in the near future?"

Shishlin responds: "I think the answer to this question has to be 'yes and no'. The fact that these countries did indeed resemble a powder keg which any spark might blow up was obvious to the unaided eye. Incidentally, the visits by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to these countries, and the contacts that took place here in Moscow, convinced us every time that changes were inevitable. The form, the nature, the scale and profundity of the changes were, of course, unpredictable to a certain extent, just as the turns in the development of events that we have witnessed in 1990 have been. But I do think that we have some of the main answers. What is it that they are rejecting? What are they leaving behind? What are they heading for, these countries? There are certainly answers to these questions. All the more since we must also interpret in some new way what happened in the past."

Ambartsumov remarks on the question of responsibility and forecasts, using historical examples of Poland and Czechoslovakia. He summarizes: "You have to take into account here that our researchers, the academics that work on the socialist countries in our institute in particular, may not always have been precise, but on the whole, I think that our forecasts have proved to be correct.

Lukin says: I think that not only scientific workers who had sufficient character for this were able to forecast, but it was possible to forecast really that the situation was such that with each year, one can say that the situation would become more and more radical because the problems—the ones which we have already briefly described—in the socialist countries were not being tackled or were being tackled in a half-hearted fashion. At the same time any attempt to resolve these problems from the point of view of internal forces, internal dynamics, was cut by internal conservative forces and by our conservative leadership. Therefore, the difference between, say, the events of 1968 in Czechoslovakia and the present events in Czechoslovakia consists in this: at the time these changes were still possible within the socialist idea and within the framework of the same political structure—true, radically altered. Now these changes are not possible in that manner. They have become more radical. And if they were delayed any longer then the situation there would be be even more severe and, indeed, the changes everywhere could be thinkable only in the Romanian version. That is all."

Lyubovtsev asks if the participants at the university are satisfied with the answers, and a university participant responds yes. Lyubovtsev thus returns to the telephone calls. "Here is a question to the presenter: I do not agree with your statement, says Mariya Nikolayevna Dubovaya from Rostov-na-Donu, that the point of view expressed by each of the participants of the program is his personal opinion. For, just as the state committee for radio and television broadcasting is a state institution, each of the participants represents one or other group of the population. Well, esteemed Mariya Nikolayevna, it is time for us to get out of the habit of expressing in one particular way the dominating opinion. In my opinion, pluralism of opinions is starting to triumph in the country, and we really are, believe me, really speaking for ourselves. The renunciation of the monopoly, of the single dominant point of view, is in my view a major achievement of the five years of perestroyka."

Shishlin says: "We have not been given anyone's authorization, to use the official terms."

Lyubovtsev poses the question to Shishlin: "What is the meaning of the term 'responsible worker of the CPSU Central Committee'?"

Shishlin says: "Yes, this is, of course, the most complicated question of all the ones here."

Ambartsumov adds: "It is usually used in obituaries."

Shishlin retorts: "Thank you, Yevgeniy Arshakovich, but things have not gone as far as that. By the way, as a new deputy to the Russian Parliament you can permit yourself any boldness and all the more so with regard to a representative of the appratus. In my opinion that is a very popular approach. But it is just a form of address. In effect I am engaged in international affairs and foreign political information in the Central Committee and, of course, in my opinion, all workers are responsible. It is a tribute to the past, to put it briefly, and I remain a political observer."

Shishlin reads the next question: Did the presence of Vorotnikov at the Communist Party Congress in Romania signify a demonstration of approval by the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee for Ceaucescu's policies? "Secondly, not long before the revolutions in Romania, GDR, Bulgaria, and Hungary there was a conference of the Warsaw Pact member countries at the highest level. Present were Ceaucescu who has been shot, Honecker who is on trial, Zhivkov, and so on. Did not this sitting down alongside dictators imply our leaders' support for the internal political, unpopular, course? And, finally, the third question. Who, personally, from the Politburo should accept responsibility for these errors by our diplomacy in the view of the peoples of the whole world.?"

Shishlin then replies; "I shall reply to the first question. I do not think that the presence of a delegation of the CPSU at the last Congress in Romania implied approval by the Politburo for Ceausescu's course. The attitude to the course conducted by the former Romanian leadership was demonstrated by the Soviet Union in thousands of ways and in the most varied forms, but as far as concerns the presence at the Congess of the CPSU, that is a tribute to the protocol which arose over decades. But I think that the author of the question is correct and that it is necessary to give thought to the nature of that protocol. It has long since become obsolete and needs to be changed. I, for example, believe that the 28th Congress of the CPSU will take place without pioneers and theri bugles, without servicemen and their greetings, and, perhaps without foreign delegates who read our previously written greetings to the congress.

"Equally, I think that we do not have the right to judge our leaders or our diplomatic workers for holding a meeting of the Warsaw Pact member countries with the participation of the leaders of those countries who were at that time in charge, be it in Bulgaria, in Hungary, in the GDR, and so on. I cannot by any means regard such a joint meeting, joint discussion, and the development of relations as errors on the part of our foreign policy. I think that it was precisely our tolerant policy with regard to the socialist countries, with regard to our neighbors in the West which prepared the ground for these changes; it helped the breakthroughs. It is no coincidence that in Czechoslovakia, in the GDR, in Bulgaria, and in other countries high level visits from the Soviet Union to those countries were a sort of yeast which raised public opinion and forced them to think of new paths and all the more so since there were great internal reasons, as well."

Lyubovtsev poses two questions for Nekipelov: "Why in the former countries of socialism—the former countries of socialism!—is the standard of living twice that in the Soviet Union? They have had revolutions, we have not, why does a totalitarian regime continue to govern in our country? And another question from Muscovite Yelena Grigoryevna Povarova: What is the point of the program if they all say the same thing? I hope that not all viewers will agree with that. She asks us to sum up the results of our perestroyka and of perestroyka in the East European countries. What they have there as a result of perestroyka is inflation and unemployment—what awaits us? Again, we are asked to reply in specific terms, first, second, third, and so on. Well, I don't know whether it is possible to sum up the results of perestroyka in East Europe, but nevertheless, that is the question for you".

Nekipelov does not want to go into detailed comparisons, but says that "indeed, in these countries, perhaps with the exception of Romania, and the situation is not too clear at the moment concerning Bulgaria, the living standards are higher than in the Soviet Union. But to begin with, one must take as the starting point that in countries such as Czechoslovakia and the GDR, and Hungary, the living standards have always been higher than in our country, so there is nothing new in this. But it is quite comprehensible to us all that the Soviet Union, in the context of the old model of the socialist community, bore in general the serious burden of military expenses, the maintenance of overall security, and so on. It also bore the burden for development of capital-intensive forms of production, and for providing the community with fuel and raw materials, and development of capital-intensive production always automatically means that you somewhat slow the rates of your own development. Now we are entering into a qualitatively new situation, and our relations—I would not want to say that we should wind up our relations, we will simply be building everything according to quite different principles, we will be making the attempt to transfer them to a market basis, a basis which would be compatible with what exists in the world economy."

Nekipelov continues: "As concerns the question that they have had a revolution and we have not, quite honestly I would not want to start any polemics on that...we would have to discuss in detail what has happened here, what has not happened, and what has happened in those countries. I am prepared to agree that to a large extent those countries have now moved considerably further along the road of change. As an economist, I am very interested in one question. Vladimir Petrovich has already mentioned here that events have now developed in Czechoslovakia in such a way that the ideas of the Prague Spring have been left behind, they have not been able to repeat themselves now. And this is correct in view of the causes that Vladimir Petrovich spoke of, the (?purely) political development of the crisis, and so on. But there is another very important question, as I see it, it is very important for our country. The fact is that in many of these countries, there are now no illusions concerning the idea of self-managing socialism. This idea has worked in its fullest form in Yugoslavia, and is in practice in a profound crisis in that country at the moment, and it has been tried in part, so to speak, in various countries. Everywhere in these countries, in Hungary and in Poland, the winding up of self-managing relations is in progress. Unfortunately, the conclusion that we are evidently coming to at the moment is that, however paradoxical it may sound,

self-managing socialism is not compatible with the market. In its framework, it is not possible to create either a labor market or a capital market, and (?hence) a flow of resources between industries. In this sense, it is very important that we do not repeat, or that we at least take into account, the experience that has already been gone through, or at least has been gone through to a certain extent."

Lyubovtsev questions Ambartsumov on what Yugoslav economists are writing, that the path which Yugoslavia is supposed to have chosen, the one steering a course between capitalism and socialism, has failed to prove itself. "What do you think of this and please answer the questions that have been put to you."

Ambartsumov responds: "There are many questions along these lines, raising the question of the collapse or non-collapse of socialism and so forth. Why is it that we, the Soviet state, are again afraid of capitalism, although we take much of these countries' experience and make it our own? I think that reflections within the terms of reference of this juxtaposition of socialism and capitalism are altogether unfruitful in our time. We devote too much attention altogether to labels.... Sergeyevich Gorbachev once used the expression 'the mourners of socialism.' Well, that is a socialism which is not needed, which we must renounce and which we are discarding. It is in fact by discarding this supposed socialism that those societies are developing in East Europe, as indeed we are."

Ambartsumov reads another question: "Why, when the events in Czechoslovakia are being remembered, is it not mentioned anywhere that there were American troops ready to go into Czechoslovakia? That was a myth created by our propaganda. True, it was not actually written openly in the newspaper, but it was all very widely [word indistinct] at meetings."

Lukin adds "It is not a myth, but a normal episode in the psychological war."

Ambartsumov says: "But it was created; a myth was consciously created just as, after our invasion of Afghanistan, they said 'if we had not gone in, the Americans would have'."

Lyubovtsev notes that the Americans were already ready.

Ambartsumov adds that it was all "just a fairytale."

Lukin recalls the year 1968—the start of a relaxation in international tension, with the SALT-1 talks coming to an end. "It was precisely at that time that this entire crisis appeared and our troops went in. It was simply not a myth, but a conscious deception."

Ambartsumov says: "Well, all right. Unfortunately, however, I am forced to state that although I have confidence in the person from Ufa, Comrade Chumokov, who asks such questions, it is typical that he talks about the monument to Lenin in Poland. He is evidently talking about the dismantling of monuments: our country could buy up these monuments, and if not, I propose a special account for the purchase of Lenin, which Krupskaya, his widow, spoke about, appealing for Lenin not to be turned into a living relic and for his praises not to be sung? Do we not have any other problems: pensioners, the fight against increased infant mortality, say? We have monuments to Lenin standing in all our towns in any case; I do not know why there are so many.... Yet we go on pursuing these myths while being completely diverted from real problems. Here is another group of questions about the world socialist system and the world socialist community once again; how are these categories to be interpreted today? I think that this will be of interest for our university colleagues. The fact is that these are mythological concepts, too. However, under Stalin one could still talk about a world system of socialism since it moved from one center, but this concept which figures in Khrushchev's 1961 party program—the conflict between the USSR and China—was already beginning then, and of course one could not speak about any kind of single system of socialism, even though we artifically operated with it in our party documents and propaganda."

Ambartsumov says that he and Nekipelov were attacked for being in the World Economic Institute, and that it was time to change its name. Nekipelov agrees.

At this point the Moscow University audience is given a chance to speak. Mukhtasipov, a doctor of sciences who is professor of Moscow University's Philosophy Department, says that he would like to ask Ambartsumov something because they used to work together:

"Yevgeniy Arshakovish has just been answering questions connected with the anxiety of the letters' authors about what socialism will be and what forms socialist ideas will take. This question comes to me in connection with the fact that Yevgeniy Arshakovich briefly recalled some of Kautsky's concepts, and said that we need to reinterpret some of the inheritance of those who worked out the theory and practice of socialism. In this context, here is a question, Yevgeniy Arshakovich. To what extent can the inheritance of Otto Bauer, who developed then interesting theory of integral socialism, or to what extent can the concepts of Renner and Kautsky, who developed the interesting problem related to problems of culture and national autonomy, when they are interpreted in a new way, exert a positive influence on the solution of many problems of socialism? Because not so long ago Comrade Slanski, ambassador to the Soviet Union, spoke about Czechoslovakia's adherence to socialist ideals. Ibrahim Boehme leader of the Social Democrats in the GDR, Gregor Gysi, and so on are also speaking about this. What, then, is the place of the inheritance of Austrian Marxism, when it is interpreted in a new way, in the development and intepretation of socialist ideas in practice and theory?"

Ambartsumov replies that this was indeed a question from a professor:

"At a general level, because I do not think it worth going into detail here, I shall say this. It contained a very powerful humanist component and an antifascist component. The Austrian Marxists were torn, so to speak, between relying on the Soviet Union which seemed to be standing against Hitler's fascism, and the disappointment which they frequently tried to conceal in the thirties with regard to the ongoing totalitarianism which was reproducing itself, with regard to the trials in the thirties, and so on."

"I would say, however, that it is not only Austrian Marxism that is concerned. In general, various social democratic components which could have been used. I completely agree about the idea of national and cultural autonomy. All in all, I think that this is a good recipe for the autonomous units which exist here, within the framework of big republics. This recipe was lightly discarded by Stalin's hand, but I would say that--and it is no coincidence that I am recalling Nikolay Bernstein here—the slogan which he promoted and which we were taught to refute at higher education establishments is new assuming a new character and significance: movement is everything and the end goal is nothing. That is, incidentally, an indirect reply to the questions being asked here about socialism as an idea and communism as an idea. We have been diverted, so to speak, by the plans of the day after tomorrow while completely disregarding man's current situation, which has been sacrificed for the sake of this fairly utopian idea. I am forced to state, although many people will not like it, that I consider that the very idea of communism is utopian, being a society of the uncontradictory ideal which generally contradicts the very spirit of the teaching. So we were diverted by this idea and simultaneously disregarding man's day-to-day interests."

Shishlin says: "Yes, well, one must probably still say that if one is to draw in the intellectual revolution of the Austro-Hungarians—or rather the Austrian Marxists—one must probably extend that intellectual wealth which remains unused. I think that the socialist idea will only win if we work on mastering the inheritance born in the acute disputes between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks."

Ambartsumov agrees.

Shishlin continues: "If you read it, there are an extraordinary number of simply fantastic surmises and forecasts, and very intereting views, to be found in what the Mensheviks were saying. And of course it is necessary to go further and draw in the full wealth of Russian philosophy. Well, that is really all I want to say."

Lukin says: "The political victors far from always prove to be the intellectual victors, but that applies to us and to East Europe, too."

Lyubovtsev says "...when ideology starts to be imposed by a state repressive leadership."

Shishlin says there are a lot of questions concerning Germany, so he will have to be brief. "The first question: What is the attitude of the comrades to a buffer zone? A very poor one, and I think that our common point of view here is that this is completely old thinking which in no way corresponds either to today's realities nor to the interests of our state, nor to the interests of our neighbors, nor to the interests of universal peace.

"Here is a pointed question from Ivan Fedorovich—there is no surname for some reason—from Kishinev: Why are the commentators soothing public opinion? A united Germany means world war III. The socialist countries have already moved away from us, what will be the position of our country in the future?

"Well, I would like to say that it is not possible to view the unification of Germany, and the process of the unification of Germany in itself, as the take-off point for a third world war. We live in a quite new and interlinked, interdependent world, a contradictory world, but in practice in a world where a third world war cannot be permitted. And it seems to me that the processes of renewal themselves which are developing not only in Eastern Europe, but also in Western Europe, the processes which are developing in international relations as such, these, as it happens, allow us to say that the threat of war is being overcome. Neither can I agree with the author of the question about the socialist countries having already moved away from us. They have moved away not from us, but, as the comrades have already said, from the administrative-command system. They are distancing themselves from the terror. They are distancing themselves from totalitarian regimes, and that means that they are moving toward us. It is another matter that this road may prove to be not a straight one, and that this will take time."

Lukin says he, too, has a large heap of questions; he will try to answer a few. "For the most part, the countries of Eastern Europe are rejecting the communist idea, while we for the time being are not rejecting it. Do we really consider ourselves more socialist, or more consistent as socialists? I am returning again to what I said earlier. Our touchstone ideological fragments continue to circulate a little within us, connected with the fact that we still want to sort out what full socialism and what full capitalism are. I think that as far as the countries of Eastern Europe are concerned processes are now underway there which will bring them to some completely new and ideological structures, and that they, too, have people who say sincerely that they have achieved this transition from socialism to capitalism, or on the contrary that it is not possible to transfer from socialism to capitalism.

"The reality is quite different, in my view, and more contemporary. There is now no capitalism such as we read about in the old and not very interesting books. And there is no such thing as the pure socialism, to our good fortune, which we took the command-administrative system to be. What is going on at the moment is a search for concepts which would combine the best features, having the socialist concepts, social democratic models, and some of the best achievements of modern thought

which might be called contemporary capitalist thought. This will not be a complete fusion, it will be, let us say, a rivalry between certain elements of the new, neosocialist, social democratic model and neoconservatism, but all of this will be a new game, a fresh field, a new drama which does not yet fit in with our frames of thought."

Ambartsumov says that Lukin's approach may be a little eclectic, but that drama is certainly an appropriate word. He notes the Swedish model of social democracy; Lukin says that it took a long time to develop, and that the important thing is to give ordinary people a decent life, so that "first the sausages will appear, and we can generalize about the 'isms' later, and if not us then our children. Let us give productive forces their freedom."

Lukin reads another question: "Do you not see a connection between the processes taking place in Eastern Europe and the processes taking place in the Baltic republics, and Lithuania in particular? What is your forecast for further relations between the Union and Moscow, and do you not think that this is a purely internal question? The question is from Comrade Lev Isaakovich Taytsev, from Vilnius.

"I certainly do see a connection, but I also see serious differences. The connection is such that it is a connection which is both an East European and an all-union one. Putting it crudely, it is a restructuring, a change of the sociopolitical system. The difference is that our relations with Eastern Europe are foreign policy ones. We have to adhere to the principles and are devoted to the principles of international law in reacting to these events. As far as Lithuania is concerned, the relationship here is considerably more complicated. It is our internal problem, although many Lithuanian comrades have a different interpretation. But undubitably, the principles of international law are not, let us say, exhaustive and dominant in what is happening now in Lithuania."

Lukin then answers a question about what the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly is and gives some brief biographical details about Dubcek, its chairman.

Lyubovtsev asks the panel to answer a few questions briefly, as the end of the program is approaching.

Shishlin picks out two questions. "In the light of the unification of Germany, the issue of Koenigberg is an interesting one. How will it be settled? Koenigsberg, that is, Kaliningrad, will continue to be Kaliningrad for now. The second question requires a more extensive answer: Does it not seem to you that we have started looking for defects of perestroyka in a distortion of the past? After all, in the period of stagnation we did have certain progress, and even stimuli. Now we are living without a past, a future, or a present. Such is the question.

"Of course, I cannot share this point of view, and would like to say that although not everything succeeds in the process of perestroyka—and of course we have to accept dramatic solutions and we have made serious blunders in these eight years already—just look, we live in a new country, in a new spiritual atmosphere. In politics, we are really advancing toward asserting democracy; and the latest decisions and the recent elections go to show this. In the economy, apart from the great negative experience which has been accumulated, the main thing has been brought out, which is that a truly radical economic reform needs to be implemented. Creation of an economy with a varied structure and creation of a market are needed. In the spiritual sphere, spiritual values are now in circulation in the country and among people which previously were simply closed to them. I think we have become spiritually richer. Economically, we have not yet become richer, but politically we have learned a lot, and I think that now, even if the present time is difficult for us, when we are speaking the truth about the past and the present, that means we will have a future."

Lukin answers a viewer who took an earlier comment to mean that Lukin thought socialism was a bad thing. Not so, says Lukin; it is a great European idea which has spread worldwide. It has two faces; the first means social justice and help for the deprived and oppressed; this will never die. "The second face was best expressed by the famous Shrikov, a character from Bulgakov: We shall smash everything, and share the fragments out equally. That cause is now dying out, and it is a very good thing that it is dying. I fear that this is not dying out completely, and that somewhere, some time, it will emerge, and this must be combated resolutely."

Lyubovstev deals with a couple of questions himself: "One gets the impression that all the participants in your conversation reject any kind of socialism. How is one supposed to understand this? Well, I think it is to be understood that they reject the Stalinist, barracks socialism, a distorted socialism that was just spoken of.

"What are the prospects for development of economic and political relations between the Soviet Union and Albania, in connection with perestroyka and the processes in our country? I think that the first signals, as yet very weak and feeble signals, about Albania's readiness to normalize relations—first and foremost economic relations—both with the Soviet Union and simultaneously with the United States, have recently been audible from Tirana, the Albanian capital, and I think that this is important and that such relations will in any case be established, because not a single country can permit itself to remain in isolation at the end of the 20th century.

"That's Albania. What is the reaction in North Korea to the changes in Eastern Europe? I think that they have a purely negative attitude there.

"How do you evaluate Fidel Castro's statements on Eastern Europe? You know, dear comrades, there was a time when all important advice, recommendations, and urgent instructions were handed out to our fraternal socialist countries from Moscow. Now there is a paradoxical picture, many are starting to give us advice on

how to run our affairs, and such advice sometimes comes, in particular, from Havana, as well.

"How do the commentators assess the events in Romania, as compared with other countries? Well, there the suppression of the individual was of a particularly harsh, crude nature, and so the explosion there was particularly powerful, but I think that we do not have time to reply to this question in more detail."

Lyubovtsev hands over to Nekipelov, who says that some viewers are asking when countries that the Soviet Union has had close economic ties with will repay their debts. Nekipelov says: "I think that if we are talking about East European countries, then there is no occasion to speak of debts in such a direct sense. It is another matter that the economic mechanism that has formed among us in cooperation has been very irrational. We have kept trying to borrow market categories, but without creating an actual market. In these conditions there could be no rational prices, and so the problem of using current world prices, which many are asking about, is not a problem of finding the prices somewhere and bringing them in here, it is a problem of creating a market in which the prices would arise naturally."

Lyubovtsev says Ambartsumov has one minute for replies.

Ambartsumov: "I have here a whole group of questions on the prospects of the Warsaw Pact and the future of our troops. I think that our troops—there is a question on Poland in particular—will be withdrawn, and that the Pact will be kept for the time being, but it will change, and it may disappear if the general European process develops favorably. I think that the future of the Warsaw Pact also depends to no small extent on the future of NATO. If the process of detente continues, then everything will be fine."

Lyubovtsev thanks the panel and thanks viewers for their questions.

West Europe

Defense Minister Yazov Visits France 27 Mar

Seen Off at Airport

PM2803135790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Text] Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, left for Moscow for Paris 27 March at the invitation of French Defense Minister J-P. Chevenement.

The following were among the sendoff party at the airport: Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General P.G. Lushev and Army General K.A. Kochetov, USSR first deputy defense ministers; Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; and other officials.

M. Pesik [name as transliterated], counselor envoy at the French Embassy in the USSR, and Colonel J-P. Yuet [name as transliterated], Air Force attache at the French Embassy in the USSR, were among the send-off party.

Meets French Counterpart

LD2703204590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Correspondents S. Iezuitov and V. Menshov report]

[Excerpts] USSR Minister of Defense Yazov arrived in Paris on an official visit today. The program for Comrade Yazov's visit contains a timetable that is arranged literally down to the last minute. That is why conversation between the USSR minister of defense and the French minister of defense took place almost immediately upon Yazov's arrival. Issues of mutual interest were discussed during the conversation. [passage omitted]

Commenting upon the beginning of the visit the LIBERATION daily even managed to find a small sensation. In its view, the meeting in the Higher Military School will be held behind closed doors. How can this be, complained the author of the short article—new relations and yet the French military are unwilling to work in the spirit of glasnost?

However, the forecasts of the French press were not to materialize, and Comrade Yazov spoke within the walls of one of France's oldest military establishments. He described our country's approaches towards the policy of security at the current stage and in the nearest future and noted that the Soviet Union was implementing practical steps along the path towards a nuclear-free and violence-free world.

[Video shows Yazov walking along red carpet observing guard of honor at airport; in meetings with officials; entering building; meeting the prime minister; cars arriving at another building; LIBERATION article, long view of unidentified building, Yazov addressing military audience]

Meets With Prime Minister Rocard

PM2803094590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Army General D.T. Yazov was received by French Prime Minister M. Rocard. During the conversation they discussed problems of mutual interest. They expressed confidence that there is a good foundation for the successful development of Soviet-French relations—

a foundation created during USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's meetings with French President M. Mitterrand. It was pointed out that the development of military contacts within the framework of multifaceted Soviet-French ties helps further strengthen trust and mutual understanding between the USSR and France.

The USSR defense minister had a conversation with J.-P. Chevenement, in which Army General M. Schmitt, chief of staff of the French Armed Forces, took part.

In the afternoon Army General D.T. Yazov addressed the Paris Military School.

Speaks at Military School

LD2803124390 Moscow TASS in English 2118 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Paris, March 27 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov staying here on an official visit spoke this afternoon at the Paris Military School, a complex of buildings housing several French higher military educational establishments.

He set out Soviet approachs to the policy of security at the present stage and in the near future.

Proclaiming its desire for a nuclear-free world without violence, the Soviet Union is implementing purposeful moves to create this world, he said. These moves are both unilateral and made together with its negotiating partners.

This vision of the world is reflected in the modern Soviet military doctrine which is strictly defensive.

The Soviet new military doctrine has been operating for nearly three years now, Yazov noted. The minister stressed that it is operating in real fact.

Regrettably, some people in the West seek to show that its defensive character is only a "propaganda action" and that, in real fact, nothing has changed.

However, it is enough to recall just a few facts to understand the actual situation: the Soviet agreement for the asymmetrical reduction of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, the decision to cut unilaterally the Soviet Armed Forces and to change their structure and training for defensive purposes.

Cuts in military spending is also an impressive substantiation of the USSR's commitment to the cause of peace, the minister continued. All these are practical moves which partners of the USSR in negotiations sometimes lack.

At the same time all these are material elements of a new security model. The Soviet Union does its best to consolidate these elements and to lend them an irreversible nature.

The Soviet policy in the sphere of security in the last decade of the 20th century is based on the worldwide system of human interests, Yazov stressed.

This system includes various values, such as a nuclear-free and democratic world without violence and universal and equal security for all.

The Soviet minister replied to questions from the audience.

Later in the day French Defence Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement gave a dinner in honour of the Soviet visitor.

Received by President Mitterrand

LD2703205190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1915 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Paris, 27 March (TASS)—Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of defense, who is here on an official visit, was received this evening by Francois Mitterrand, the president of France.

France's Mitterrand on USSR, Germany, Europe

PM2703095590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "F. Mitterrand Interview"]

[Text] Paris, 26 Mar—We must now proceed from the fact that M.S. Gorbachev has been elected president of the USSR. He has displayed determination and abilities in the matter of transforming the social system and people's way of life, French President Francois Mitterrand has declared in an interview with the French TF-1 television company. He said that "there has been a breath of freedom, debate, and dialogue" in the USSR and "there is no reason to deny Gorbachev our trust."

He also expounded France's stand on Lithuania's unilateral declaration of independence. In order to form a correct idea of this problem and make any judgments, it is necessary first to possess the maximum information, the president remarked. It must be remembered that for a long historical period Lithuania was part of Russia. While voicing the opinion that Lithuania's right to sovereignty cannot be doubted, at the same time F. Mitterrand pointed out that Lithuania is "an inalienable part of the Soviet Union."

Speaking of the present situation in Europe, the president broached, above all, the question of Germany's unification. Emphasizing that the main conditions of this process must be its peaceful and democratic nature, as well as commitments from the future Germany with regard to the inviolability of the existing borders and adherence to the ideas of European building, he acknowledged that the most complex problem on this plane is that of Germany's attitude to the military alliances. This must be approached with caution and

imagination. In any event it was clear that NATO's forms and essence must be "revised in depth, including aspects of the strategy" of the bloc. In this connection the president advocated the need to elaborate the concept of "European defense." A correct solution to the question of German unification today required the formulation of an approach to "the problems of Europe as a single whole." "The organization of Europe as a single whole," the French head of state pointed out, "is one of the most important tasks of international politics today."

French Feel 'Triumphant' on Lithuanian Events

PM2703113590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 p 5

[Report by own correspondent N. Dolgopolov under the rubric "What Do They Think to the West of Vilnius?": "Paris"]

[Text] Lithuania, Vilnius... Never before have the French written so much about the little republic. Lithuania is no longer presented as a Soviet republic but as a country which is seeking or has achieved separation from the USSR. The tone of the commentaries is not so much sympathetic as triumphant. The press and, in particular, television have forgotten, as it were, that there are other shades and nuances than black and white. So French television correspondents' reports from Lithuania usually start by showing armored personnel carriers. The impression is skillfully created that the Soviet Government is making ready to resort to the use of armed force at any moment, come what may. This is aided by the constant references to the events of 1956 in Budapest and 1968 in Prague. The speeches by leaders of the Lithuanian community in France are extremely unfriendly.

Any statement by Landsbergis is assured of loud praise. The Soviet president's actions are criticized. It seems that, with the hardening of the U.S. position, this criticism is mounting all the time.

The subject of the Lithuanian deposits kept in the National Bank of France is constantly surfacing. The Lithuanian Government transferred its gold reserves to the French and the British before joining or, as they say here, being annexed by the USSR. Even during the difficult war years these gold reserves remained inviolable, despite requests from the Soviet side. Now, however, judging by all accounts, it may be returned to its previous owners.

Nor has this been denied by French President Francois Mitterrand. Speaking on television, he stated unequivocally: France has always refused to recognize the annexation of Lithuania or of any of the three Baltic states and remains true to the decisions it took. Lithuania's right to sovereignty cannot be contested. Dialogue is the only way to solve the problem.

French Economic Minister Holds Talks in Moscow

Soviets 'To Pay Off Their Debts'

LD2703171290 Paris Europe Number One in French 0600 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Pierre Beregovoy is in Moscow accompanied by a large delegation of French businessmen: He is there to discuss bilateral trade. The Soviets announced straight away that they were going to pay off their debts, here is Oliver Samain:

[Begin recording] French businesses are making the settlement of this dispute a matter of principle and they obtained satisfaction on the first day: Pierre Beregovoy in fact received from his Soviet counterpart Lev Voronin an assurance that the arrears would be paid. This commitment will allow about 10 French businesses to recover the 600 million to 1 billion or so francs for which they have been waiting for several months. [passage omitted]

With this promise from Moscow, a big cloud between France and the USSR is now fading, leaving the way open for new agreements. The next one is well on its way: It provides for French colleges to train 6,000 Soviet cadres over the next three years. From Moscow, this is Oliver Samain for Europe Number One. [end recording]

Voronin, Beregovoy View Cooperation

LD2703032790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1345 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Correspondent Dmitriy Leontev report]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Mar (TASS)—The state and prospects of commercial, economic, and scientific-technical links between the USSR and France are at the center of attention of participants in the 24th session of the Soivet-French intergovernmental commission on economic, industrial, and scientific-technical cooperation, which opened here today.

Speaking at the opening of the session, Lev Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, noted the forward development of economic relations between the two countries. In particular, cooperation in atomic energy, space research, agriculture, and the production of consumer goods has been stepped up considerably. At the same time, Lev Voronin considers that far from all possibilities are being used for the development of full-blooded bilateral links.

Pierre Beregovoy, cochairman of the Commission on the French side and minister of the economy, finance, and the budget, having evaluated the stable character of relations between the USSR and France in a positive way, on the whole, noted a number of negative aspects, as well. Included among these is the reduction by 15 percent in 1989 of the volume of French exports to the USSR and the insufficient development of joint enterprise.

The sides noted that in order to develop relations further, it is necessary to reorient the structure of Soviet exports toward increasing the sale of machinery and equipment and to develop cooperation on the basis of the more effective use of Soviet scientific developments.

Ryzhkov Receives Beregovoy

LD2803094690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS)—Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, today received in the Kremlin Pierre Beregovoy, French minister of state for economy, finance, and budget, who has been taking part in the first session of the French-Soviet Intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Industrial, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation.

Giving a positive appraisal to the state of Soviet-French cooperation, Nikolay Ryzhkov noted that the current session is of an unusual nature: Soviet and French representatives are meeting for the first time since the combining of the "big" and "small" commissions with the aim of coordinating more clearly and actions of organizations in the two countries which are involved in development of economic and scientific-technological ties. A solid legal foundation was laid for the future promotion of mutually beneficial relations in a number of promising areas of industry and science as a result of the signing of a series of new intergovernmental documents during Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to Paris last summer, in particular the declaration on principles of development and improvement of industrial and scientific-technological cooperation.

At the same time, the possibilities for substantial expansion of traditional trade, as has been noted before, have largely been exhausted, and the future of trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and France primarily depends on renewal of the structure of reciprocal trade and more energetic use of new forms of cooperation. The prospects for promoting trade and economic ties between the two countries are to a large extent also determined by the progress of economic reform in the USSR.

Pierre Beregovoy noted France's readiness to foster the stepping up of the work of French firms and organizations in the Soviet market. Viewing this as very promising, France attaches great importance to its presence there, despite today's difficulties in the Soviet economy.

Thanking the French Government for its support for the course of perestroyka, Nikolay Ryzhkov briefed Pierre Beregovoy on the development of economic reform in the USSR, including reform in the sphere of foreign economic activity. He said that meetings held recently at the USSR Council of Ministers with directors of industrial enterprises and associations and with workers in the financial and banking system have shown that the economic managers firmly advocate forging ahead along the path of promoting economic reform and formation of a planned market economy.

During the exchange of opinions, issues of involving the Soviet economy more actively in world economic ties, including participation in international economic organizations, were also touched upon, as were issues of improving the conditions for the work of joint enterprises, and Soviet-French cooperation in the training of highly qualified foreign economic personnel.

Taking part in the conversation were Lev Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Anatoliy Adamishin, deputy USSR foreign minister; Gayrat Rakhimbayev, deputy USSR minister for foreign economic relations; and also Jean-Marie Merillon, France's ambassador to the USSR.

Ryzhkov Urges 'Updating' Cooperation

PM2803091190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Conversation in the Kremlin"]

[Text] N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received P. Beregovoy, French minister of state and minister of the economy, finance, and budget, who is taking part in the work of the first session of the Soviet-French Intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Industrial, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation, in the Kremlin 27 March.

Having voiced a positive opinion of Soviet-French cooperation, N.I. Ryzhkov pointed out that the current session is unusual since this is the first time that Soviet and French representatives have met since the "grand" and "small" commissions were amalgamated with a view to coordinating more precisely the actions taken by the two countries' organizations involved in developing economic and scientific and technical ties. A firm legal foundation was laid for the further deepening of mutually beneficial relations in a number of promising areas of industry as a result of the signing of a number of new intergovernmental documents during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Paris last summer, particularly the declaration on principles for the development and improvement of economic, industrial, scientific, and technical cooperation.

At the same time, it has already been pointed out on previous occasions that the opportunities to expand traditional trade have in many respects been exhausted and the future of Soviet-French trade and economic relations depends primarily on updating the structure for reciprocal trade and making more active use of new forms of cooperation.

P. Beregovoy noted the French Government's willingness to help step up the work of French firms and organizations on the Soviet market.

The following took part in the conversation: L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.L. Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister; G.F. Rakhimbayev, USSR deputy minister of foreign economic ties; and J.M. Merillon, French ambassador to the USSR.

Beregovoy Comments on Lithuania

LD2703175590 Paris Europe Number One in French 1700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Lithuania is more than ever a republic under pressure—the pressure on the spot in Vilnius, where a demonstration by those against independence, a pro-Moscow demonstration, is taking place at this moment, and the pressure of the Red Army paratroopers, who harshly arrested some 20 deserters last night and who are overrunning the headquarters of the Central Committee. [passage omitted] Pierre Beregovoy [economy minister], who is in Moscow, has asked his Soviet interlocutors to do everything possible to find a peaceful solution.

Rocard, Genscher Cited on Security, German Unity

PM2703104190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS reports under the general heading "Disarmament Is Key Issue"]

[Text] New York, 26 Mar—France supports German unification, but the process should not lead to a revision of the results of World War II in Europe. This was indicated by French Premier M. Rocard in an interview with TIME magazine.

"German unification should not eliminate the results of World War II, including its remaining psychological scars," the French head of government stated. Nor, in his opinion, should the process lead to a revision of the FRG's positions as regards its rejection of the possession of nuclear weapons.

In Rocard's words, the three-week delay before FRG Chancellor H. Kohl confirmed the inviolability of Poland's western border along the Oder-Neisse line "caused a certain amount of concern, not least in France." "However," the French premier stated, "this has not changed our position, which is to support German unity." "The fewer problems there are between the Germans themselves, the fewer the rest of the world will have," he stressed.

German unification will not slow the process of integration within the EC. Not a single EC member, even Britain, Rocard said, can afford to leave the community. Economic integration has now reached too high a level. The continuing differences in foreign policy orientation between France and the FRG will lose their importance as integration is further developed, Rocard believes. "Only Europe's global power is of real importance," he stressed.

At the same time, the French premier advocated retaining NATO. "Soviet military might will continue to present a problem until a security system is set up within the talks process," he claimed. "We need NATO in order to exert pressure at disarmament talks."

The premier also advocated maintaining the presence of U.S. troops in Europe over the next few years. In his opinion, they should not be retained "forever" but until the European countries shoulder the defense burden themselves.

Bonn, 26 Mar—In the opinion of FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher, disarmament is the key issue in the "unification of Europe and of Germany, too." This is why, he stated in an interview with Sueddeutscher Rundfunk Radio, we should embark on the second round of talks in Vienna immediately after signing the first agreement on conventional arms in Europe. These talks should be aimed not only at bringing about a subsequent sharp reduction in all armed forces, but at discussing the creation of structures which would be purely defensive.

In the future, the minister holds, the functions of both military alliances in Europe will change fundamentally. They will increasingly assume political functions. In other words, the alliances will become elements in a common European security structure.

During consultations on the "two-plus-four" formula, he noted, we should clarify the external aspects of unification so as to ensure that their results can be presented at the CSCE summit.

Soviet-British Relations 'Clouded' by Gordiyevskiy

LD2703122590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Video report by correspondent V. Shishkovskiy in London; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Regrettably, it sometimes happens in international life that the good relations for which particular states have worked hard can in a moment be clouded by, let us say, an unkind gesture by one of the countries, or by a thoughtless action. I do not want to say that the incident that our London correspondent is now going to report on will have exactly such consequences for Soviet-British relations, but it is quite clear that it cannot help their development.

[Shishkovskiy] [video shows London street scenes, Big Ben, Thatcher speaking in Parliament] Many people in Britain are genuinely pleased that Soviet-British relations, which had not always developed smoothly, have considerably improved in recent years, as reflected in the broadening of trade and economic, scientific, and cultural ties and other contacts between us. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher herself has more than once spoken with satisfaction of this, and has remarked that relations between the USSR and Britain are now better than at any time since the war.

However, as far as one can judge, such a state of affairs is not much to the liking of certain British circles, for how else can one judge the appearance in British papers now of opuses by the traitor to the Soviet homeland, former KGB staff member Oleg Gordiyevskiy, who was recruited by the British special services and was in 1985 illegally removed from the Soviet Union to Britain? [video shows assortment of newspaper headlines, close-up of photograph of Gordiyevskiy, clip of BBC announcer and of Gordiyevskiy sitting in an armchair by an open fire holding some magazines]

He was recently kindly invited to hold forth on British television, having first been obliged to put on a wig and a ginger beard. The unseemly campaign being waged by the British media, in the worst traditions of the cold war, was summed up appropriately at a briefing held at the Soviet Embassy in London. [video shows briefing]

That campaign was judged there to be a blatant attempt by someone in Britain to darken the constructive dialogue currently taking place between Moscow and London, and make Soviet-British relations worse. The briefing also raised the question of how the commonly accepted rules of international law can be reconciled with the actions of official British representative abroad, who organized the illegal transfer of the traitor Gordiyevskiy from Moscow to Finland and then to London.

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Carries 27 Mar Supreme Soviet Session

Lukyanov Opens Session

LD2703165590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service at 1500 GMT on 27 March begins carrying a recorded relay of the 27 March USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Moscow Kremlin.

Supreme Soviet Chairman Lukyanov opens the morning session, inviting deputies to take their seats and register: 410 are present. Lukyanov declares the joint session open and announces examination of bills dealing with taxation. He recalls Ryzhkov's statement on the bill on the tax system last October. The Supreme Soviet has since instructed relevant committees to do further work on it. Today's subject concerns three bills on first reading: on income tax, on cancellation of taxation on single persons and small families, and on the rights of the tax inspectorate. Lukyanov calls USSR Finance Minister Pavlov to the floor to deliver a report on the subject.

At 1506 GMT Pavlov describes the bills as part of the transition to a planned market system. The tax reform is aimed at democratizing the whole system. The ultimate goal is progressive taxation based on declarations. He promises to deal with just some main points, as deputies already have sight of the full text of the bills. He outlines the changing income profile of the population. All states use taxation to regulate the market; the USSR will do likewise.

At 1511 GMT Pavlov notes that time is needed to prepare for a completely different taxation system and describes the policy towards which the government is aiming. The progressive income tax system must make provision for the low-paid. He sets out the provisions of the current bills and describes how they will operate in practice for taxpayers. It is planned to raise the income tax threshold from R70 a month to 90; other proposals are summarized. The changes are expected to raise a mere R30-40,000,000 per annum for the exchequer—the main aim is greater justice in distribution of wealth. Plans for taxation of high earners are described: top rate is to be 60 percent.

At 1520 GMT Pavlov deals with taxation of income from shares and other securities and from fees earned by writers and other cultural workers. Tax will be paid on just pure profits, rather than total income. Provisions for other specified groups of workers are set out. Limits are to be set on gifts received in kind. Pavlov outlines these and the procedure concerning invalids.

At 1526 GMT Pavlov explains that the USSR proposes to go over to a taxation system based on a taxpayer's permanent place of residence, rather than on his citizenship, as before. Instructions concerning execution of this legislation will be issued by the Finance Ministry in conjunction with the Justice Ministry, to ensure that they do not deviate from the law.

At 1528 GMT Pavlov outlines provisions concerning gold-miners and servicemen and their exemption from taxation. Other exempt groups are enumerated. The old tax on childless people is to be lifted.

At 1532 GMT Pavlov outlines other measures designed to make the taxation system more dynamic and summarizes proposals received from parliamentary committees and others.

At 1539 GMT Pavlov turns to the tax inspectorate, as one of the instruments necessary to put the new policy into practice. A Main State Tax Inspectorate is to be set up, with the task of implementing the new policy and keeping tabs on payments, including watching the activities of both large and small enterprises, down to cooperatives and persons engaged in individual labor activity.

Pavlov says there will be scope for preventive work against tax evasion and sanctions against offenders. Economic sanctions are currently symbolic; this will change. The system will ensure equality for all taxpayers in their dealings with the authorities. The inspectorate will have the same rights to investigate enterprises as it presently has vis-a-vis individuals, including the right to confiscate relevant documents. It will be entitled to apply sanctions immediately a violation is uncovered.

At 1547 GMT Pavlov says the inspectorate will also have the right to check individuals' declarations concerning the origins of items which they have purchased. Other sanctions are outlined, including penalties for failure to keep accounts.

At 1549 GMT Pavlov urges deputies to support his proposals and concludes his speech.

At 1550 GMT Lukyanov proposes that spokesmen for the relevant parliamentary commissions speak, before debate commences. He offers the floor to Gubarev, of the Planning and Budget Commission. Gubarev presents the thoughts on the bill of the working group set up by his and other commissions. Today's economic reform runs counter to current legislation, which has to be changed. He summarizes other general conclusions reached by his group. He calls for greater encouragement for giving to charities and supports Pavlov's proposal on exemptions for gold-miners and servicemen. Dividends on shares should not be taxed if the holders reinvest them.

At 1559 GMT Gubarev deals with Pavlov's proposal for sanctions against tax-dodgers and calls on the Supreme Soviet to promote pride in the phrase: I am a taxpayer, as in the United States. He expresses fears of the potential for an inflationary spiral resulting from the rise in money in circulation.

At 1604 GMT the continuity announcer promises further coverage of the Supreme Soviet session after a 15-minute interval.

Planning and Budget Officials Speak

LD2703175490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1619 GMT on 27 March continues its recorded relay of the 27 March Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

The session resumes after a 15-minute interval, Nishanov is in the chair. The floor is givent to Deputy Feskov of the Planning and Budget Commission of the Soviet of the Union. He outlines some of the categories exempt from taxation, referring to foreign practice in this area, and the commission's proposals on low paid categories. He goes on to proposals concerning various married and unmarried groups. He reads out proposals from other committees and commissions, in particular a proposal from the committee for women's affairs.

At 1630 GMT Deputy Smirnov from the same commission takes the floor. He speaks of some of the problems that have afflicted the enforcement of taxation, makes proposals for improving this work in current conditions of a growth in cooperatives etc. He notes the need to adopt the law on tax inspectorate, but also notes certain shortcomings in the draft presented, referring to various observations that have come into the commission from deputies. He moves on to Pavlov's proposed amendments, regarding the work of the proposed tax inspectorate.

At 1639 GMT Deputy Drunina takes the floor, noting lack of personal interest, as an invalid. He refers to the possibility of writers and others suffering from poverty as a result of draft law, drawing a distinction between the minority of rich writers and the majority of those less well off. He notes considerable contribution by writers to the state budget, and lack of provision in draft for them and their families. He concludes by noting the importance of culture for society.

At 1649 GMT Deputy Yaroshenko from Turkmenia takes the floor. He opposes adoption of the income tax bill, and proposes reworking of the bill. He says there is indeed an alternative bill on taxation, but that it has proved difficult to bring it to deputies' attention, protests against unparliamentary practice. He notes higher rate of taxation in USSR in real terms as compared with foreign countries. He also notes growth in prices, referring in particular to recent rise in gold prices from which the mafia has profited. He objects to lack of concept in the draft laws. He draws attention to the need for individuals and enterprises to retain a certain percentage from their incomes. An argument follows concerning time limits, and Lukyanov warns the speaker not to suggest the government is being dishonest. The speaker continues, moving on to proposals concerning taxing land and makes various other proposals for improving the draft law on taxation.

Amendments to Tax Bill Discussed

LD2703191190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1702 GMT on 27 March continues its recorded relay of the 27 March Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

An unidentified deputy takes the floor, supporting the idea of reforming the taxation system, but noting the need to approach the matter from the point of view of justice. He draws attention to the provisions concerning those working in difficult conditions.

At 1706 GMT Deputy Lapygin calls for the draft to be approved but suggests some improvements. Young army officers, for example, are poorly paid while having family responsibilities. Tax concessions should be given to them. The draft law specifies precise wage bands, which will soon be rendered obsolete by the current high inflation rate and more and more people will come within the higher rate tax bands. The law should be corrected annually to take account of inflation.

At 1713 GMT Nishanov announces a 30-minute interval

At 1714 GMT the afternoon session begins. Culture Minister Gubenko takes the floor. He criticizes the introduction of an alternative draft law by Yaroshenko, adding that if it is to be considered, its provisions on taxation of cultural facilities should be altered. He says that Drunina's criticisms have already been taken into account in later drafts of the official version. He makes suggestions as to precise changes in the wording of the draft to improve financing of cultural measures from charitable sources. Union Republics should have the right to make tax concessions for cultural workers.

At 1722 GMT Deputy Borovkov requests, on behalf of the women's affairs committee, alterations in the draft for the benefit of women, veterans, etc. At 1728 GMT Deputy Karlov of the Committee on Science and Education says that the committee has prepared an alternative draft, but this has not been distributed. Lukyanov says it has been distributed. Karlov outlines his proposals on taxation of regular incomes. It must be socially just, stimulate people to work, and avoid sharp changes in tax liability. He displays a graph showing how tax liability would increase with income.

At 1737 GMT Chairman Lukyanov says that tax is not just a mathematical exercise but a political act.

At 1738 GMT Deputy Valentinov of the Ecology Committee details minor changes he would like to see in various points of the draft.

At 1745 GMT Lukyanov says that precise proposals should be submitted in writing. Valentinov continues.

At 1747 GMT Deputy Korshunov agrees with Lukyanov's earlier statement that taxation is a political act. He says that tax should ensure social justice. The tax on small families should be removed in the very near future.

Prizes given once a year should not be taxed as if they were earned in the month they are received. He supports concessions for young officers and says that concessions should be made in accordance with family size.

At 1753 GMT Deputy Vasnetsov of the Union of Artists says that earnings on works of art should be considered to have been earned over the whole period of creating the work of art and not in the short period in which the reward is received. He compares Soviet practice with Belgian. He also mentions that great expenses to which artists are put in the course of their work, especially in the case of sculptors, for example. He thinks that some points in the draft need rewording and urges the commission to do this. He concludes by talking about an interesting exhibition now open in the Krymskaya Naberezhnaya arts center—since it normally gets no publicity.

AT 1800 GMT a deputy whose name is indistinct again raises the question of the material position of servicemen. They have received no pay increase this year. Officers and non-commissioned officers, however, had a R50 increase, and the men, in general, saw this as a first step towards overcoming the lagging behind of their pay levels. He goes on to detail the serious position of many servicemen—for example, those who are having to return from postings abroad. Heroine Mothers are also in great difficulties, especially in Azerbaijan, where they are particularly numerous. Finally, he asks that Ryzhkov should receive him and Deputy Mamedov to discuss the situation in the Armenian frontier region.

Sobchak Speaks on Inflation

LD2703194290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1806 GMT on 27 March continues its recorded relay of the 27 March Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Deputy Sobchak takes the floor. He talks about the gradually rising maximum tax rate, now 60 percent. It was 50 percent in tsarist times. He thinks that it would be more fair if the Supreme Soviet made adjustments annually, when discussing the budget, bearing in mind the current rate of inflation. He calls on the finance minister to submit in the future full financial details to the Supreme Soviet instead of just saying that there is no money for projects X, Y,and Z. The Supreme Soviet should not have to actually believe anyone—the facts should be available to it. He fears that if nothing is done about tax rates, individual labor activity will go into headlong decline. He questions the rights of the union republics—the draft law makes no mention of them.

Turning to cultural workers, Sobchak says that penal taxation will lead to a drift of Soviet talent to friendlier tax climes abroad. Some of his figures are challenged by an unseen speaker. He comments on the unfairness of high rates of taxation on royalties earned by deceased husbands, for example, and paid to their widows or other dependants. He also challenges the wording of the draft that appers to grant full powers to tax inspectors to examine any premises they like, thus leaving no trace of the constitutionally guaranteed right to privacy. On behalf of Leningraders, he voices the request that persons who survived the Leningrad blockade should be relieved of income tax.

At 1819 GMT Deputy Shamikhin praises the draft law in general, but says that income that falls below the national minimum should not be taxed. He goes on to comment on the relationship between taxation and the longer life expectancy that is now generally anticipated, and on the role of tax inspectors.

At 1825 GMT Deputy Samarin says that deputies should be discussing the philosophy behind the bill rather than the small details. He goes on to say that the proposed high rates of taxation will vitiate the advantages conferred on farm leaseholders by recent legislation. He also criticizes the tax benefits given to large families: The figures show that they are insufficient to make any real impact on their standard of living. He thinks that the bill needs rewording in some places.

At 1831 GMT Deputy Burlatskiy criticizes the mechanical transfer into the draft under discussion of many features of foreign tax legislation, despite the fact that the foreign legislation operates in fully developed market economies. Moreover, all forms of work are equated in the bill. Burlatskiy moves on to the question of taxation of creative writers, and the danger that such people will leave the country. He says the provisions on this matter need reworking.

At 1836 GMT Lukyanov provides further information on taxation of creative workers. Deputy Babchenko takes the floor. He supports the idea of exempting those on the minimum living standard from taxation. He also supports Sobchak's idea of creating an index taking account of inflation. He makes further proposals on taxation of unmarried and childless persons, but supports adoption of draft at first reading.

At 1842 GMT Lukyanov proposes some further discussion, and then an end to the debate. An unidentified deputy takes the floor and rejects some of the figures that had been cited by previous speakers.

At 1844 GMT Lukyanov announces a break until 1600 Moscow time.

At 1845 GMT the evening session resumes. Lukyanov gives 40 minutes for the debates. Deputy Grachev takes the floor. He raises the matter of payment of taxation into local or state budgets with reference to yesterday's debate on another bill. Grachev proposes raising the minimum salary free of taxation from R90 to R100. He points to what he regards as other injustices in the draft provisions on progressive taxation. He recommends reworking the draft.

At 1853 GMT Deputy Rakhmanova takes the floor, noting the benefits of charitable funds, and their difficulty in raising money. He expresses concern in connection with proposed taxation of donations above a certain limit and proposes removal of taxation from such donations.

At 1901 GMT a deputy whose name is indistinct, from the Veterans and Invalids Committee, takes the floor. He supports some of the previous proposals concerning servicemen. He repeats the previous proposal concerning taxation of rear workers during the war years. He also supports Sobchak's proposals concerning veterans of the Leningrad blockade.

At 1907 GMT an unidentified deputy takes the floor. He also points to the discrepancy between the proposed minimum threshold of R90 and the reputed minimum living standard of R100-120. He proposes reworking of provisions regarding agriculture.

At 1912 GMT Deputy Pukhov takes the floor. He takes issue with a previous speaker, Korshunov, on tax differentiation between the sexes. He suggests raising the minimum threshold, if only for those with dependents. He makes various proposals concerning various underprivileged groups. He proposes adopting a draft at the first reading.

Deputies Support Bill, Debate Ends

LD2703214690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1918 GMT on 27 March continues its recorded relay of the 27 March Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Deputy Tsarevskiy takes the floor, noting the principle of justice in the draft on the working class, in particular such workers as miners working in difficult conditions. Miners gained extra pay for night shifts after the recent strikes. It is not fair that this should now be taxed. The draft should be sent back for revision. There should be an officially recognized minimum living standard.

At 1923 GMT Deputy Savitskaya refers back to what Rakhamanova said about concessions for donations to charity and refers to U.S. experience Soviet tax law should follow this example.

At 1926 GMT An unidentified deputy says the recently adopted package of laws will stimulate the economy and raise wages, so the tax stages named in this draft will soon be outdated and act as a brake on incentive.

At 1929 GMT Finance Minister Pavlov returns to the rostrum to answer questions which have been submitted to him. He says that tax rates for low-paid workers is either being reduced or staying the same. He criticizes Sobchak's speech differentiating types of work. The only measure should be the amount of money received. If some tax is devoted to charities, others will have to pay more. He disagrees with the miner who suggested that particular workers should be treated according to the difficulty of conditions; this is a function of pay and not of taxation. The minimum wage for taxation was decided on the basis of the total taxation income required. He criticizes Yaroshenko's alternative version, pointing out which categories would gain and which would lose. Karlov's mathematical version would make most workers worse off.

Pavlov says the proposal to remove tax from women without children is to be implemented. Students do not receive a large enough grant to come within the lowest band so there is no point in excluding them. There is a mass of unsolved social problems and priorities have to be allocated. The various tax bands will be kept under review.

At 1944 GMT Deputy Gubarev returns to the rostrum to say that the creative unions have vetted the legislative proposals and found them satisfactory. He does not think that the proposed taxation is so punitive that creative talent will be forced to seek refuge abroad. Objections to that effect are ill-founded, he says. The tax levels, which affect only the prosperous, are actually quite low. He justifies the high rate of taxation on self-employed people by saying that, unlike conventional enterprises, they pay no tax on profits. Only their personal incomes can, therefore, be taxed in lieu.

Turning to the alternative version of the proposed legislation, Gubarev says that the original version is much better than the one supported by Yaroshenko. He takes issue with the idea of taxing savers' interests, saying if savers are frightened, they will then withdraw their savings and try to spend them on non-existent goods. In conclusion, Gubarev urges the deputies to accept the draft law at the first reading.

At 1957 GMT an unidentified deputy who spoke once before says that the burden of the proposal is to penalize those who work hard.

At 1959 GMT Lukyanov reminds deputies that time is short—too many people wish to speak. Most of those who have spoken have voiced support for the draft—only four have opposed it. If taxation is reduced, there will be problems in paying tomorrow's pensions, he says. Issues must be considered in connection with all related issues. Lukyanov proposes a vote on ending the debate. After registration has taken place—398 deputies are present—the vote is taken: 369 for, 16 against, seven abstained. The debate is thus ended.

Deputy Zhuravlev says that the draft law will undoubtedly be passed, but asks; have all the issues been properly understood? Will all the problems considered be solved by the law for all time to come? The important thing is to make the economy healthy. He recommends that the draft should be referred back to the committee for additional work.

MVD Law Approved

LD2703221390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2007 GMT on 27 March continues its recorded relay of the 27 March Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Lukyanov pursues Zhuravlev's point and agrees that some additional work should take place. He then attempts to put the draft to a vote. An unidentified deputy raises an objection, which Lukyanov says can be dealt with in committee. Deputy Sharipov suggests that tax officials must bear additional responsibilities. Lukyanov says that all this can wait until the committee stage. Lukyanov puts the draft to vote, pointing that the proposed amendments should be forwarded to the relevant commissions. The vote is taken: 220 for, 131 against, 41 abstained. The decision is thus adopted by a straightforward majority of those present, says Lukyanov amid some confusion over voting procedure.

Some discussion then follows over whether a draft law can be adopted by a majority of those present or by a majority of the overall number of deputies on roll. Lukyanov refers to the rule book to prove his point. Deputy Koryugin reads out from the rule book. Lukyanov says that the chambers are confronting an issue of principle: Is voting to be based on the number of deputies actually present or on the total number of deputies on roll? Deputy Ryzhkov raises a specific point from a past sitting. Deputy Smirnov comes to the rostrum to clear up a point arising from the proposed unrestricted right of entry by tax inspectors to any premises.

Lukyanov suggests that the best way forward would be to put each of the three sections of the draft law to an individual vote. He insists on making progress and putting each section of the bill, now to be treated as a separate law, to a separate vote, as envisaged by the rule book. He puts the first law, dealing with income tax, to the vote. The result is: 240 for, 111 against, 39 abstained. The Soviet of the Union passes the bill; the Soviet of Nationalities will have to vote again tomorrow.

Lukyanov then puts the second part, dealing with the abolition of the tax on childless persons, to the vote. The result is 328 for, 45 against, 17 abstained. Both chambers pass this law. The third law, on tax inspection, is then put the vote. The result is 208 for, 153 against, 28 abstained. This third law thus did not pass its first reading and is declared to be in need of further work. The Soviet of Nationalities is then invited to vote once again on the first law. The result is 101 for, other results are not seen. The Soviet of Nationalities will have to perform additional work on the law.

At 2035 GMT Abalkin comes to the rostrum to speak in favor of setting up a state committee for nationalities issues. He provides an outline of some of the matters it is to deal with, and of previous bodies working in this area. He notes the existence of similar bodies in foreign countries—such bodies have been set up in the RSFSR and Lithuania. Abalkin proposes adoption of a law on the creation of such a body.

At 2041 GMT Deputy Meleyev asks a question as to the size of the staff of the body. Abalkin says it is difficult to say, but that it will be small. There is another question on possible overlapping of functions with other bodies—Lukyanov clarifies.

At 2047 GMT a question is raised as to whether there will be sub-bodies in the localities and whether there will be such bodies in republics not suffering as yet from ethnic strife. Medvedev expresses concern that there should not be excessive haste in view of the neglect of these issues over the years. Abalkin agrees, but says they are already late with this matter.

At 2050 GMT Smirnov takes the floor to oppose the creation of such a union-republican committee for nationalities issues. He points to the likely duplication of such bodies in the republics and the consequent expansion in personnel, in spite of Ryzhkov promising that there would only be reductions in such personnel. He proposes creation of state commission with no increase in staffing or budget.

At 2054 GMT Lukyanov gives background to the matter. For the purpose of voting, he asks both chambers to register; there are 390 in all. He puts the matter to the vote; for the adoption of the law on creation of the union-republican state commission for nationalities issues. The result is 274 for, 78 against, 34 abstentions. A total of 386 voted. Lukyanov says both chambers have passed the law—209 registered in the Soviet of the Union, and 181 in the Soviet of Nationalities. In the Soviet of the Union 136 voted for, and in the Soviet of Nationalities, 138 voted for.

At 2058 GMT Lukyanov says there have been two amendments from the Soviet of the Union to the draft law on internal troops, and reads them out. Lukyanov says if the Soviet of the Union votes in favor, then the law will be adopted. He puts it to the vote, on adopting the draft law with the amendments cited: 193 for, four against, 9 abstentions. The law on the duties and rights of the internal troops of the MVD in maintaining public order, is thus adopted.

Joint Session To Meet USSR Government

LD2803031290 Moscow Domestic in Russian 0200 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] The third session of the country's Supreme Soviet will continue its work today. At 1000 [0600 GMT] the deputies will gather for a joint session of the chambers. Today they will meet the USSR Government. In the course of this meeting, ministers will answer questions from those elected by the people.

Regular Sessions Planned

LD2803063790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0620 GMT 28 Mar 90

[TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Mar (TASS)—Nikolay Ryzhkov, the Soviet head of government, and the members of his cabinet have a hard day ahead of them: For the first time in the history of the Soviet parliament the USSR Council of Ministers is answering deputies' questions. This form of government accounting to legislators, which is new to the USSR, henceforth will be permanent. It is planned to set aside the last Wednesday of every month for questions in the Supreme Soviet to the Council of Ministers.

Journalists forecast that the most difficult questions today will be those on the progress of fulfillment of the government program to improve the economy. In the first three months it has been under way, the negative tendencies in the national economy have not been mastered.

Up to this morning, more than 140 questions have come in from deputies.

Three Hours Devoted to Questions

LD2803085790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] Half an hour ago the latest joint session of the Soviet of the Union and of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet opened in the Kremlin. The first three hours today will be devoted to governments replies to questions of USSR people's depluties. As we know, the decision has been made earlier that every last Wednesday of the month should be devoted just to this work. Today 26 members of the government have to meet the deputies.

The parliamentarians demonstrated intense interest in this form of work. Over 50 extensive notes, containing 140 questions, were submitted in advance. They cover a wide range of topical problems in the life of the country. There are some private questions, the answers to which will be given to the deputies personally.

At present Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Commission for Food and Purchase, is answering deputies' questions.

Supreme Soviet Discusses Taxation Bills

LD2703174990 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet parliament discussed a package of three taxation bills in the first reading today.

One of the bills determines income tax rates, another envisages a stage-by-stage cancellation of the bachelor tax and the third stipulates the rights of state tax inspectorates.

Submitting the bills, Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov said "they will mark the beginning of radical tax reform—part of the country's transition to a plan-market economy."

He said the income tax bill was aimed at creating equal conditions for all categories of working people.

As compared with the taxes that are now in effect, the new system presupposes easy tax rates on wages of under 150 roubles. Tax rates on wages of under 700 roubles will hardly change, while higher wages will be covered by a progressive income tax system.

Viktor Yaroshenko of Moscow submitted an alternative draft on behalf of a group of deputies.

"One morning we may wake up to learn that our salaries are not enough to pay our taxes," he said.

Under the alternative draft, the income tax is calculated on the basis of the aggregate annual income received by tax-payers from all sources, irrespective of the sphere of their activity. The no-tax income minimum takes into account the composition of one's family and is changed depending on the inflation rate.

Viktor Gubarev of Krasnodar region, who spoke on behalf of the planning and budgetary-financial commission, said this "seemingly beautiful" draft cannot be taken seriously as the first year of its implementation would require some 11 billion roubles in additional budget allocations, a developed tax inspectorate system and all-out computerisation.

Disagreement during the discussion had an effect on the vote.

The income tax bill was passed by the Council of the Union in the first reading but failed to get enough votes in the Council of Nationalities.

The bill cancelling the bachelor tax was adopted by both chambers, and the bill stipulating the rights of state tax inspectorates was voted down and sent for amendments.

State Committee for Nationalities Formed

LD2703214590 Moscow TASS in English 2126 GMT 27 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—The full Soviet parliament today decided to form the USSR State Committee for Nationalities Affairs. Leonid Abalkin, deputy Soviet prime minister, emphasised that the absence of a body capable of regulating inter-ethnic relations negatively affects their state.

He noted that 60 million people or 20 percent of the Soviet Union's population live outside their national formations. Germans, Poles, Koreans, Bulgarians and other ethnic groups residing in the USSR have no such formations.

"There is an urgent need to pass on from methods of a fire brigade extinguishing the suddenly arising conflicts to planned and consistent work to regulate ethnic relations in the country," Abalkin said.

He said that the USSR State Committee for Nationalities Affairs could discuss as priority tasks perfection of the national-state structure, enhancement of the legal status of national autonomy, protection and development of ethnic originality.

The Soviet parliament today discussed in a first reading a package of three taxation bills. One of the bills determines income tax rates, another envisages a stage-by-stage cancellation of the bachelor tax and the third stipulates the rights of state tax inspectorates.

Soviet Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov said the bills are part of a series of new legislative acts directed towards economic reform.

During a heated debate the bill on income tax was criticised for what many believe to be an inordinately high rate of taxation. The bill was passed in the first reading by the Council of the Union but has not earned the number of votes to be passed by the Council of Nationalities. The bill on cancelling the bachelor tax was passed by both chambers while the bill stipulating the rights of tax inspectorates was turned down and is to be revised.

At the end of today's meeting the Council of the Union endorsed amendments to the earlier adopted bill on rights and duties of Interior Ministry troops in protecting public order. On Monday the document was adopted by the Council of Nationalities. Thus the document has been passed by both chambers.

Lukyanov on Amendments to Internal Troops Law

LD2803075890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2058 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Remarks by Supreme Soviet Chairman Lukyanov on amendments to draft law on internal troops—recorded]

[Text] I want to raise the following question before the chambers. The point is that both chambers adopted, at the second reading, the USSR law on the obligations and rights of the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs while preserving public order. It was adopted by a majority vote. Everything is fine. But the Soviet of Nationalities introduced into that law two small amendments because, in the Soviet of the Union, no account had been taken of the fact that there might be presidential decrees on the matter. They considered it prior to the congress. In article one, the Soviet of nationalities mentioned "by decrees of the president" and, in part two, article three, also mentioned "in execution of a decree of the president." If the Soviet of the Union now votes for these two small amendments, the law will be adopted. Can I put the draft to a vote of the Soviet of the Union?

[Deputies] Yes, yes. Read out the text together with the amendments. [Confused noises]. Yes.

[Lukyanov] I'll read it. I'll read you the full text. Here's article one. "The internal troops form part of the system of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and are guided in their activities by the laws of the USSR and other legislative enactments of the USSR, by decrees of the president, decisions of the Council of Ministers, and combined service regulations." The second, also an amendment. I'll read it out. "The involvement of internal troops, and the discharging of the obligations indicated in the relevant article are effected by decision of the Ministry of Internal Affairs in cases envisaged by point three, part one of the present article." Point three is "take part in ending violations of public order." "The decision is taken at the request of the council of ministers of the relevant union or autonomous republic, or with the agreement of the USSR Council of Ministers, with compulsory examination of the given question by the Council of Ministers of the relevant union republic or autonomous republic, or in execution of a decree of the USSR president." That's clear, comrades, isn't it?

Abalkin on Draft Law on Nationalities Issues

LD2803082390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2035 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Address by Deputy Premier Leonid Abalkin to Supreme Soviet session 27 Mar—recorded]

[Text] [Lukyanov] I think that we will examine one more draft law now which we have here, so as not to halt matters. I am referring to the creation of a state committee of the USSR on nationalities questions which was envisaged, as you may recall, at the Congress of Peoples Deputies. Comrade Abalkin will say a few words. [murmuring from hall] We still have time; it has not expired yet.

[Abalkin] Esteemed people's deputies. A draft law on creating the state committee of the USSR on nationalities questions is proposed for your attention. As you know, contemporary problems, the present situation in our country has aroused particular attention for the examination and resolution of a broad range of problems in the nationalities field and the field of relations between nationalities. The absence of a special state body which can regulate these relations has a very negative effect on practical matters. An insistent need has arisen to move on from methods of working like a fire brigade extinguishing conflicts which arise unexpectedly to carrying out planned and consistent work to regulate ethnic relations and relations between the nationalities in the country.

I would like to note that in our country, over many decades, many problems relating to this sensitive issue were not tackled. Many problems have arisen. There is an absence of a precise legislative, including constitutional, regulation of these relations. It would seem to be essential to examine in the first instance questions connected with improving the national-state structure, raising the legal status of the national autonomous structures, restoring the rights of the people repressed in the war years and in the postwar years, and protecting and developing individual national characteristics and the culture of numerically small peoples and also of nationalities which do not have their national-territorial formations, or which live outside the boundaries of them.

I would like to report to you, as a matter of information, that at the present time one fifth of the population of the country, 60 million people, live outside the boundaries of their national formations or else do not have such a thing at all. Those lacking national formations are the 2 million Germans, 1.1 million Poles, 437,000 Koreans, 379,000 Bulgarians, 350,000 Greeks, 269,000 Crimean Tatars, 270,000 Meskhetian Turks, 153,000 Kurds, and other nationalities.

As is known in our country, from 1917 to 1923 there existed as part of the government a special body in the shape of the People's Commissariat for Nationalities' Affairs, whose main task was to form national republics and prepare them for unification in the USSR. As well as that work on national-state structure, this commissariat paid great attention to questions of interethnic education, the training of national cadres, and the development of national culture and languages. In 1921 the number of personnel in its central organs was 875.

In preparing the proposal on this question, we looked at the experience of other countries even though none of them has such complicated problems in the field of ethnic and interethnic relations. However, in a whole range of countries there exist special organizations regulating these relations. One can cite, in particular, that the governmental bodies of China include a committee on nationalities, and in the United States there is an Indian Affairs Bureau and an immigration service. There are similar services in Canada and a number of other countries.

It seems that the creation of such a committee could make it possible to rationally build relations with union and autonomous republics and to promote the harmonization of interethnic relations in the country. Of course, a considerable number of the issues fall directly within the competence of sovereign union republics and other autonomous formations. And, evidently they, on the spot, are able to resolve independently many practical questions and determine whether or not it is appropriate to create within their compositions special committees or other bodies to manage national relations. As of today such bodies have been set up in two republics: in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic where, by decree of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the republican state committee on national questions has been set up; and a committee on nationalities' affairs has been set up in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic.

On the nature of the body which is being set up: It is envisaged that this could be a body which would fulfill coordinating and distributing functions by analogy, if one can use pure analogies for comparison, rather like the existing committee for labour and social questions and possibly the state committee for questions of the use of nature. If necessary, this question should merit special study; bearing in mind the importance of the problems which arise, it would be possible to bestow the leadership of such a state committee on one of the deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

Comrades, the direction and main functions of the proposed committee are set out in detail in the memorandum presented by the government to the USSR Supreme Soviet which you have to hand. The draft has been given a preliminary examination and has been approved by the Commission for National Policy and Interethnic Relations of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet. We propose the adoption of the law on the creation of this committee, and on this basis the government will introduce the corresponding proposal for it to be discussed at the Supreme Soviet.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Opens First Presidential Council Meeting

LD2703204790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Video report of the first sitting of the USSR Presidential Council, chaired by President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, held on 27 March at the Kremlin—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Hello, comrades! The first session of the Presidential Council of the USSR took place in the Kremlin today under the chairmanship of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] I greet you all, dear comrades; I greet you on the first sitting of the Presidential Council and I declare it open. I have to say, without unnecessary emotionalism, but all the same, this is a special day. The first sitting of the Presidential Council is a symbol of the new state system, of a new stage in the development of the reforms brought by perestroyka and the political reform, and one can say, comrades, in the history of the country, too, in the history of the country.

I have been thinking about how we should conduct this first sitting. It could be simply a matter of getting to know each other and confining ourselves to the discussion of certain organizational questions. But no doubt that would hardly meet with your understanding, and evidently the country, too, is expecting the Presidential Council and the president to embark upon the solution

of the great and complicated and difficult tasks without delay and without putting them into the pending tray. I think that the expectations in society in connection with the introduction of the institution of the presidency are great, they are great—at least the information that I receive is precisely like that. But this does not mean that we have to do things at breakneck speed simply in order to demonstrate that we, the Presidential Council, have already set about things actively.

We need, before taking steps of one kind or another, once again to weigh everything up well, think it over, and consult one another. We really are faced with implementing, taking major steps in all sectors of perestroyka. But this means, even more, that these steps should be well thought-out, weighed up, and they should be implemented with the hope, the certainty, that they will also give definite results. I am now avoiding a statement to the effect that they will be supported by the whole of society. It is probably unlikely to be so; it would probably be unrealistic to count on this. But all the same they should be understandable to society, in any case to the larger part of it. [end recording]

Taking part in the work of the Presidential Council were Comrades Aytmatov, Bakatin, Boldin, Kauls, Kryuchkov, Maslyukov, Osipyan, Primakov, Rasputin, Revenko, Ryzhkov, Shatalin, Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, and Yarin. Present at the sitting was Comrade Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Comrade Gorbachev, president of the USSR, spoke to members of the council. An exchange of opinions on issues raised in the president's speech took place.

Text of Gorbachev Speech

PM2803085990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

["Along the Path of Resolute Transformations. M.S. Gorbachev's Speech at the USSR Presidential Council 27 March 1990"]

[Text] Comrades,

We have a special day today. The first meeting of the Presidential Council symbolizes our new statehood, a new stage not only in the development of transformations resulting from perestroyka but also, one can say, in national history.

I have thought about the form in which the first meeting should be held. We should apparently exchange opinions and appraise the processes and the situation in the country. We should establish priorities.

First, considerations of a principled nature.

In implementing perestroyka's policies, we have firmly started to democratize society and establish people's power from bottom to top.

Life shows that we have made the right choice. Democratization and glasnost created the appropriate conditions for shaping and implementing progressive policies aimed at the renewal, one can say, revival of our society on the principles proclaimed in October 1917.

I am convinced that in the long run the success of perestroyka can be ensured by consistently implementing a policy that develops and deepens democratic processes in our society. This refers to the economy, to the sphere of politics, to the social sphere, inter- ethnic relations, etc.

It is in this context that the establishment of the Soviet socialist presidency should be viewed. This is not the revival of personal power in a new form.

The presidency is an important instrument for the protection and development of democracy on the road to the humanization of society, the assertion of the liberties and dignity of the individual. It will serve in the interests of the people.

At the same time, the extent to which society is truly civilized, free, and democratic can be measured by the degree to which it holds every man responsible to himself and to other people in moral, legal, economic and other areas.

In short, all of our activity must promote the steady enhancement of social responsibility.

This is one of the vital tasks of the president's activity. The institute of presidency was introduced at a difficult time in the country's development. Our society is passing a historic milestone.

Our actions and decisions should keep abreast of the times.

Analyzing recent work, we have concluded that perestroyka must be radicalized. We must introduce substantial correctives in the policy, methods and pace of transformations.

I have already said at the Extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and wish to repeat now, that there is not only a need for more radical transformations. This need has existed for a long time. We have also experienced a new way of organizing the economic, social and political spheres of society. There are legal and economic prerequisites in the form of laws that have already been passed and legal acts that are being formulated. Our federation will be profoundly transformed on their basis.

No less important is the fact that there have been profound changes in the consciousness of the working people. An awareness of the need for renewal is growing. Finally, the actual socio- economic life and tension in society also necessitate speedier changes.

All this creates an absolutely new situation and opens new opportunities for policy and practical actions.

People may retort that society is very unquiet and unstable. Order and discipline have slackened, inter-ethnic relations have become exacerbated. People experienced a lot of difficulties and disappointments and want a quicker solution to problems and a calm and normal atmosphere.

Is it justifiable in these conditions to advance the further radicalization of perestroyka, of social transformations? Now, comrades, we approach the underlying question: How we should act now and how we will solve emerging problems.

There is no denying that there are people who are gripped with nostalgia and who suggested "backtracking," returning to the period of stagnation and even the one that preceded stagnation. These are, certainly, dangerous prescriptions. We would make a gross blunder in policy and doom the country and people to new tragic trials, if we followed these suggestions. This must be said firmly and responsibly.

The solutions to all problems and answers to all emerging questions should be sought on the way forward, not backward. The advance should be more decisive.

We must remain aware of the confusion that reigns in people's minds.

Correct assessments are the main thing. No truly revolutionary changes can be made without a struggle. On the one hand, all the inertia, everything conservative that has accumulated during the epoch of authoritarianism, during the total rule of the administrative-command system, fiercely resists removal.

On the other, we come up against the impatience of those who would like to see tomorrow, if not today, the flourishing of a new life, the triumph of social justice, freedom, democracy, material well-being and spiritual liberation.

In a human way, one can understand this, but real policies cannot be built on this. Impatience often results in extremism and destruction, which can affect the economy, democratic structures and ethnic relations.

If we want to accelerate social progress in the country—and we do—we can take only one road: the comprehensive stimulation of each individual's creativity, initiative, and sense of responsibility, the emanicipation of man and society, and the thought-out and balanced removal of everything that impedes the implementation of these tasks, while most carefully maintaining the previously-built foundation of social stability and culture.

Our perestroyka is a revolution, but a special revolution. This is the first really large-scale peaceful social revolution in history.

One of the main tasks of our society, which is breaking old societal structures in a revolutionary way, is to stay on the non- violent road and to create insurmountable obstacles against forces pushing for confrontation, internecine war, mutual intolerance and ethnic strife.

It is important that everyone understand that the realistic forces of society must be consolidated in order to ensure perestroyka's success.

If we understand this and implement this understanding into practical deeds, we will take an unprecedented step in civilization's history. Our perestroyka can become the beginning of an epoch of non-violent, bloodless social transformations.

However, the distance between a plan and its implementation is great and difficult to span.

But I am inspired by the fact that the present generations, learning lessons from the past and correctly assessing current realities, have mustered sufficient strength to assume responsibility for the fundamentally new socio-historic solution, despite the incredible political, economic, and psychological difficulties lying in store for us. All this, including the main difficulties, lies ahead.

It is during this complex and infinitely difficult time that the presidential power is taking effect. Of course, it is not a panacea and one cannot expect some supernatural, unbelievable results from it—there must be no illusions on that score.

But it gives society the possibility of achieving nationwide accord in new conditions and at a new level.

Assuming the presidential duties, I am well aware of the difficulty of this historic period, the scope and acuteness of problems that have accumulated in society, and my personal responsibility stemming from this.

I would like to share some considerations on immediate practical steps to implement perestroyka and to accelerate social transformations.

I think our immediate tasks include the comprehensive analysis of the state of our economy and the elaboration of specific measures to radicalize the economic reform. There is food for thought here.

We took a responsible approach to the work on the guidelines of the economic reform—we had many discussions and consulted economic managers, scientists, and work collectives.

We also took practical steps, above all, in transferring industries to work on the principles of cost-accounting and self- financing and developing the cooperative movement, the contract, the lease system and other new forms of economic life.

Yet, we have failed to implement the whole complex of measures. Economic levers are actually not used. This refers, above all, to price-formation, banks, the monetary-financial, and taxation systems.

The lack of economic levers for state pressure and the existing monopolization, even super-monopolization, of our economy have made the rights that we delegated to enterprises lead to serious imbalances in the income, investment and price policies and to the disorganization of the market.

There are also imbalances in the cooperative movement, although the latter has an immense positive potential.

In short, mechanisms of sound competition have failed to work. Direct ties are mostly of a pre-market, natural character. Commodity-and-money relations are not developing.

We do not yet have a normal market, in the generally-accepted sense of the word. This impedes the reform and has an effect on the general state of affairs in the economy and on the provision of the population with consumer goods.

It is the failure to solve economic problems that is the cause of the social and, to a considerable extent, ethnic tension. It also provides favorable conditions for the flourishing of the shadow economy and the speculation in scarce goods.

We always emphasized the importance of interest as the driving force of development and of the meeting of man's requirements.

But now interests are often manifest in destructive forms. As a result, labor productivity remains unchanged, while wages are growing.

Many factories do not work at full capacity, capacities are used inefficiently. Yet this in no way affects the economic position of enterprises and work collectives.

In many cases, economic mismanagement, far from diminishing, is even growing. How then is all this to be covered? By the artificial price inflation which is possible due to the monopoly position of enterprises and to the availability of low-interest credits.

Ultimately, all this leads to the emission of more money and to discrepancy between the growth of the mass of commodities and money incomes.

Inflation processes are growing in the country, threatening to put the economy out of control. We cannot leave it in such a state. We must say bluntly and honestly that the existing mechanism of the economic reform needs to be radically corrected and completed.

We need measures that would help us overcome temporary difficulties and make the economy work at full capacity—on the basis of interest, the development of business activity and the formation of a normal, fully-fledged market for the just exchange of commodities and for the development of sound competition stimulating highly productive labor, scientific and technical progress and the production of high-quality goods.

If someone thinks that all this can be done under compulsion, pressure, by intimidation and other outdated methods, this is a harmful illusion. I think we need measures now to effect drastic changes in the management sphere, encourage collective joint stock capital and elaborate anti-monopoly legislation. We also need effective anti-inflation measures, and much else besides.

The land reform is a special issue. We should become aware that the adoption of the law on land is a major turn in the agrarian policy.

We need to create the necessary conditions to enable the huge creative potential inherent in this law to work at full tilt and the farmer to gain confidence that from now on and forever he is a fully-fledged master of the land.

It is quite entirely obvious that new approaches and decisive steps in the economic transformations are needed. Their essence can be formulated concisely as a controlled transition to market relations. This calls, above all, for transforming the monetary and financial systems, switching to new relations between enterprises and banks, based on mutual interest and benefit. We need to pass more rapidly to a deficit-free state budget and to a reorganized price-setting system.

Looking at things realistically, we can say that state property will continue to prevail, but opportunities inherent in it should be tapped by using diverse and flexible forms of management coupled with the rational development of small-size enterprises on the basis of cooperation, family enterprise, and collaborative efforts with foreign firms and banks.

Transition to the market should involve to the greatest extent possible the renunciation of all possible forms of fund allocation, rationing, barter exchange and distribution—everything that makes up the basis of real power by the command appartus.

We really need to replace "centralized" management based on barter and rationing with a true financial centralism, combining state control over macroproportions with economic independence and the interested initiative of enterprises and citizens, which is implemented within the framework of their market equality and partnership.

A fundamental breakthrough towards satisfying human needs and improving the people's life seems possible only on this path. Moves to enhance social protection, primarily of small-income segments, must undoubtedly be prioritized in the package of measures.

In emphasising the urgency of this task, we need, however, to point out that protection should not allow encouragement of sponging and irresponsibility. Payment according to labor should underlie social justice.

In my estimation, we are at a most important turning point that calls for profoundly thought-out solutions. I propose to devote the next meeting of the Presidential Council to the discussion of these issues. We cannot drag

our feet at this time. Instructions on this score have already been made and comrades say that in 10 to 15 days we can discuss these proposals in principle and in practical terms. Let us agree about this today.

The economy is our number one practical task. But we cannot hope for successful economic transformations without implementing political reform, just as it is difficult to hope for a success in the political field without economic reform.

Elections have just been held in our country. The power of the people is asserting itself. The real and comprehensive transition of power to the soviets is taking place these days, weeks and months.

But, in my view, the importance of this turn in society has not been fully comprehended. Essentially, local soviets are now taking on responsibility for absolutely all matters concerning man's life. These are housing and food, health care and education, commerce, law and order.

As a president, I see two key elements here. First, the passage and adoption in the Supreme Soviet of a law on local self- government, which would give all necessary powers to local bodies, needs to be accelerated as much as possible.

Then we can hope that the renewed pool of deputies of local soviets will be able to accomplish a good deal and, without losing a single day, will join in the work to address matters, will take upon themselves the responsibility for resolving ripe problems and developing solutions to long-term problems.

The efficiency of the work of local soviets will largely depend on how soon and at what level a competent and efficient aparatus will be formed.

Another important element. New soviets will be able to begin work rapidly and effectively if they find active support on the part of the Supreme Soviet, the government and, certainly, the newly formed executive presidency.

The Presidency Council should regard this support as its important task. On the other hand, no mechanism of implementing presidential decisions is more comprehensive and reliable than the soviets, their chairmen and executive committees. Everything is clear here. Although work ahead is enormous, it should be accomplished within the short term.

At today's meeting of the Presidential Council, I would like to emphasise the local soviets' responsibility for implementing new forms of management. The legislation, which is in force in the country, gives extensive rights to the soviets as regards the cooperative movement. How and on what foundation it will be further developed largely hinges on their position and practical work.

On the one hand, the scope of the cooperative movement does not satisfy us, and on the other, some miscalculations were made at the initial stage, which brought about imbalances and negative phenomena in the activity of some cooperatives. There is a large field of activity here and high responsibility before the people.

The soviets bear huge responsibility for carrying through the land reform. We have treaded a long path to it, encountering great difficulties and overcoming resistance. An uneasy quest was under way in society for our further approaches to agriculture and how to build a new agrarian policy.

But even now that the Law on Land, a program law opening ample opportunities for transforming the countryside, was adopted, I am not sure that things will go fast and without difficulties, comrades.

Soviets must show power here and with their authority support the land reform. In choosing forms of management, all farmers should find in them reliable guarantors and assistants in this new and not easy matter.

This is not all. Soviets should be pooling efforts to begin facelifting social aspects in the countryside.

In this case they will need assistance from cities, collectives of industrial enterprises, and at the present stage—impressive support for and due attention to this question from central authorities.

To be more specific, we need to implement a large-scale program to build housing, as well as cultural and service establishments in the countryside. We must construct roads and resolve issues concerning the storage and processing of agricultural produce.

Despite the importance of our work until now, this has not satisfied farmers and society as a whole. In a word, the Presidential Council should pay special attention to the unconditional implementation of the law on land and other decisions pertaining to the radical land reform.

The radical transformation of our federation on the basis of a union treaty is a priority among domestic political issues. I believe this is so important that there is no need to prove it.

Life and processes we are encountering in Transcaucasia, the Baltic Republics, especially in Lithuania, and other regions necessitate the urgent examination and settlement of appropriate issues.

For this purpose I plan to hold a federation council meeting even this week.

The president and, naturally, the Presidential Council should focus all their activities on the observance of laws. We shall not make further headway in reforms or in democratic development if legal nihilism continues to reign supreme in society.

As the Soviet president, I intend to make the observance of laws one of the key areas of my activities. I believe that we should begin with resolutely raising the responsibility of all law enforcement bodies.

It is inadmissible, comrades, that, despite the powerful and far- flung system of these bodies, we permit the growth in crime, impunity, and systematic violations of human rights. In fact, personal security of people and their property are put into jeopardy.

There are, of course, problems of giving more financial support to law enforcement bodies and providing them with equipment. We began to tackle tham, and we shall do this work. But, even now, they have vast potentials to ensure law and order on the whole.

Society has the right to demand that their leaders, some of them are, incidentally, members of the Presidential Council, should resolutely step up the struggle against crime.

They should not make any references to difficulties, shortcomings or perestroyka and other reasons. This should be done urgently and resolutely, relying on soviets, work collectives, and public organizations.

To coordinate activities of law enforcement bodies at this acute stage we should entrust this work to the following group of Presidential Council members: A.N. Yakovlev (convocation), V.A. Kryuchkov, V.V. Bakatin, V.A. Yarin, enlisting executives of other law enforcement bodies.

Urgent measures do not obviate the need for continuing and deepening the current judicial and legal reform, including the updating of penal, civil, and economic legislation.

In a word, we must do our utmost to create a normal and calm situation in the country when every citizen, no matter where he lives, could count on real security and efficient protection of his rights.

As for international affairs, we pursue a clear-cut policy based on the principles of new thinking, which are approved by the nation and are met with a favourable response in the world. But it would be a delusion to believe that this is the end of our endeavors, and work will be done on its own.

Now that changes have gained new dynamism and another dimension, many new serious problems are arising. This concerns disarmament, the European process and our actions in Asian-Pacific and other directions.

We should also rethink questions of our cooperation with East European countries. Quite new tasks are arising in the sphere of foreign economic relations. We have a limited time to resolve them.

It is necessary to begin urgent work on many specific questions. For instance, how shall we build our economic relations with developing countries?

These questions need clear replies. Incidentally, society displays greater interest in them.

Or take the problem of exports and imports. We cannot leave, without a change, a situation when the country has turned, in effect, into a supplier of raw materials and now heavily depends on food supplies.

We should clarify how long we are to import great quantities of pipes and rolled stock while being the largest producer of metal in the world.

Last but not least, the problem of transition to world prices in trade with all countries and, consequently urgent measures to effect the transition to the ruble's convertibility.

All this is so important that I believe a mechanism for analysis, drafting proposals, and control should be set up at the level of the Presidential Council.

Summing up my considerations, I see the destination of presidential power in raising the efficiency of functioning of not only the top echelon, but the entire system of state power and administration.

I mean deeper division of functions and higher responsibility of each administrative unit for fulfilling its duties. Without accomplishing this, I do not believe that we shall achieve aims we set while introducing executive presidency.

I hope for active work of council members, frankness and freedom of discussion. For my part, I shall do everything to maintain this atmosphere.

'Vremya' Interviews Gorbachev 27 Mar

LD2703214890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Interview with President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, by "Vremya" correspondent on 27 March in Moscow following the conclusion of the first session of the USSR Presidential Council—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, the first session of the Presidential Council has just ended. If possible, please inform us about what was discussed.

[Gorbachev] At the first session there was a free and open exchange of opinions which related to [changes thought], which concerned perestroyka, the life of society, the situation which has come into being in society at the present time. It was a very interesting exchange, in so far as the potential—already I felt this at the first session of the Presidential Council—the intellectual potential and its competence gave rise to satisfaction on my part. That is perhaps the first impression I experienced. This promises to serve the cause well. You

know what was important and interesting? I felt that alongside me were convinced supporters of mine, although I would say they are all people who are far from identical in their experience, in their education, in their experience of life, in their temperament. And we were faced with the main question: How and where are the answers to be sought to the problems which acutely face us today and the solution of which is awaited by society? The common reply—I would sum up like that, I have indeed given it as the common reply of all members of the Presidential Council—consisted in the fact that there can be no return to the past. All answers have to be sought in moving forward and building up all areas of perestroyka. And in this connection very many interesting proposals were voiced. That is the first thing.

Second, we immediately got down to the cardinal questions. This gladdened me, too. And although there were some sharp discussions here, many arguments were brought forward. All members of the Presidential Council spoke; each of them gave various arguments. And I am able to say that everyone stressed the thought that first and foremost we have to deal with the issues of the economy. They demand greater attention today, because economic reform has fallen behind the other reforms and primarily the reforms in the political sphere. We have already agreed to devote the next Presidential Council, to devote it especially, to the topic of the ways of radicalizing economic reform. I think that this will be the Presidential Council or sitting at which far-reaching decisions will be made. We have attempted to reveal now, already, what radicalization is, what is to be understood by this. But the discussion will take place in about 10-12 days. Instructions on this count have already been given and comrades have supported my idea, my proposal that these issues need to be discussed, without delay. Proposals have already been, in practice, prepared.

The next issue—I think, will also be unexpected...[Gorbachev corrects himself] it will not be unexpected either by you or by television viewers. This issue—the issue of land reform—was at the center of attention of the members of the Presidential Council. I would say that the members of the Presidential Council were unanimous that this is a cardinal issue, an issue which touches on the problems with foodstuffs, that is the life of the individual, the everyday life of the individual, his health, an issue which touches on the fate of our countryside, the peasantry. That is everything which might be attributed to the fundamental issues, the basic issues of our life, today and in the future.

Sharp words were said here. The main thoughts which ran through all the arguments of comrades, members of the Presidential Council, amounted to, consisted of the fact that a real mechanism must be found in order to reveal the potential of the law on land, which was recently adopted by the Supreme Soviet. It is a progressive law. We agreed that it will be the theme of the special second sitting of the Presidential Council and all the relevant documents and concrete measures have to be prepared for that. I think that is a particular priority and that is one of the strategic questions of the policy of perestroyka. And so, obviously, in 20 days or so, in the course of a month, that question will be a topic of discussion, too. We think that these are two major questions which will determine how the economic transformations in our country will progress further, and not only in what forms but also in what time frame. We will discuss (?this) with the involvement, the participation in the sitting of the Presidential Council, of major representatives, most important representatives of our sciences, although in the Presidential Council itself there are such representatives. I think that we will also invite representatives engaged in practical work too, in both one case and the other.

I should say that all share the anxiety which exists in our people in connection with the instability, the violations of social order, and such phenomena as extremism of every trend and type. All members of the Presidential Council—we discussed that problem very heatedly and even spoke out in favor of forming—of instructing—a group of members of the Presidential Council to take immediate direct operational control over, and the coordination of solving, these tasks connected with ensuring that there be more order in the country, and that our law enforcement bodies act decisively, and not only them, but the whole of the public. I think that a great deal needs to be done here already in the near future. And such instructions were already given at this Presidential Council. Comrade Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev will lead a group of members of the Presidential Council.

In any event, we went on in our discussion of the problems of the life of our future federation, but this issue was not considered in a detailed manner because a sitting of the Soviet of the Federation is planned for Friday. The atmosphere was open and free. I think that not only I was satisfied with this first sitting, but also the members of the Presidential Council. In any case, as one of the members of the Presidential Council said in describing the discussions and reacting to the atmosphere in which this sitting took place, he felt himself to be in the normal course, perestroyka, and that he does not need to rack himself and this inspires him. I must say it is very likely that others also supported him in this. In short, this first sitting was essential and it is important for such an exchange to take place. Specific decisions lie ahead.

[Correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, if it is possible, a few words about the Presidential Council itself. This is an absolutely new structure for our country. And what is it? A group of higher advisers attached to the president? Or is it all the same; a working group which elaborates and makes decisions? Will its activities not duplicate those of the Central Committee Politburo, the Council of Ministers, perhaps the Supreme Soviet?

[Gorbachev] Of course these are bodies attached to the president [pri prezidente]. The president decides and the president adopts decrees or issues instructions. But this

working body functions alongside him; it will discuss all issues of domestic and foreign policy and thereby create and work out proposals for the president and will thereby both give assistance to and also exert influence upon the president and the adoption of the various decisions. I think that that kind of combination of the prerogatives and responsibilities of the president, with a competent body like the Presidential Council, will make it possible for us to find more correct and well-considered solutions and to make fewer mistakes in decisions. Overall, I think that this is what is necessary for successful activity by the president.

[Correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, it is known that the members of the Presidential Council are appointed by a presidential decree.

[Gorbachev] Yes.

[Correspondent] That is your right.

[Gorbachev] Yes.

[Correspondent] As president, what criteria do you use in selecting the members of your team, so to speak?

[Gorbachev] There is only one criterion: They have to be supporters of the policy to which the president himself adheres. And in the present Presidential Council, I see people who think like me, comrades in arms. This is the main thing. Without this the president can neither work and operate effectively, nor are you hardly likely to receive any help from a Presidential Council if there is another approach. But these are independent people—I have known them for a long time—and perhaps it is worth it. When I was thinking about whom to include in the Presidential Council, I bore this in mind. These are independent people, each one of them is an individual, enjoying authority, I have to say, not just in certain circles but in our society as a whole. That, too, was taken into account. And I hope and I think that this was the correct approach.

Composition, Role of Presidential Council Viewed

PM2703152790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 p 1

[S. Kiselev article under the "Topical" rubric: "All the President's Men"]

[Text] So the first president of the Soviet Union is now at work. And he is no longer alone. The other day he issued decrees on the composition of his team—the USSR Presidential Council. What do we know about the new institution of power? Not a lot. Just what is written about it in Article 127 of the USSR Constitution. The USSR Presidential Council's task, according to the Basic Law, "is to elaborate measures to implement the basic thrusts of USSR domestic and foreign policy and ensure the country's security."

Only one person—N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers—is an ex officio member of the Presidential Council. The rest are nominated by the president.

There are 16 names already. I say already, because more are possible: The composition of the Presidential Council is not numerically defined by the Constitution and, consequently, it is the personal task of the country's top official to determine where the line is to be drawn.

Like many others, I have been studying the personnel of the "Gorbachev team" in an attempt to grasp the logic determining his choice. Ten of the sixteen are members of the CPSU Central Committee, and five of them are full or candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. One—the writer Valentin Rasputin—is not a member of the party. The USSR Presidential Council includes five ministers, three academicians, two writers, one worker, and one representative of agriculture. In terms of nationality, they break down into Russians, an Armenian, a Georgian, a Latvian, a Kirghiz, a Ukrainian....

That is to say, if the president pursued the logic of "representativeness," it must be observed that he managed to incorporate pretty broad forces into his small numbers of advisers.

The Presidential Council, insofar as I grasp the purpose of this innovation, legitimizes the old and well-known political institution of advisers. Until recently our government's advisers remained in the shadow (privy counselors?) and it was only by chance that we were able to learn of the role played by a particular figure in drafting important decisions of the authorities. For example, quite recently we learned from an interview given by L. Abalkin (see KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 February) that Academician Shatalin enjoys the greatest influence on the government. Now what was "privy" has become "public": S. Shatalin is a member of the USSR Presidential Council.

While the majority of the "presidential team" are well known to public opinion, at least four of them are not yet household names.

V. Boldin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee General Department, is an economist who worked as an economic observer and then departmental editor on PRAVDA. From 1985 through 1987 he was an aide to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary.

G. Revenko is first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Kiev Oblast Committee. He is 53 years old, almost 30 of which were spent first in Lenin Communist Youth League work and then party work.

Yu. Osipyan is vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Solid State Physics, and chairman of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies Tellers' Commission.

A. Kauls is director of the Latvian Agrofirm Adazi.

What will the Presidential Council deal with? Under the Constitution, it is only "to elaborate measures to implement" what has been planned by the Congress of People's Deputies and the president. The Presidential Council is not entitled to promulgate laws, decrees, or resolutions. Its job is solely to advise and serve as a "think tank," as is customary in many civilized countries.

Members Interviewed

LD2703225490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 27 March in its "Vremya" program broadcasts an interview with two members of Gorbachev's Presidential Council, V.A. Yarin and Yu.A. Osipyan, by an unidentified correspondent. The Council members are asked how they view their role. Yarin says: Today we briefly exchanged opinions in a direct conversation. Each member of the Presidential Council spoke and preliminarily determined the range of directions of the obligations of the members of the Presidential Council. Yarin says he desires to be of assistance to Gorbvachev.

Osipyan says that his participation in the Council is dictated to a certain extent by his specialization as a scientist and scholar in the natural sciences. He believes that he will be involved in drawing up the policy in the field of science, technology, and to a certain extent in implementing economic solutions.

Asked about his worker's background, Yarin declares his respect for Gorbachev as president of the working class. Osipyan is referred to as a supporter of market relations but assures the correspondent that, in spite of this, he will take into account opposing opinions. The video shows the two men being interviewed in a corridor.

Members Comment on Tasks

LD2703100290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0722 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

How is the composition of the Presidential Council, the new influential body being created under the Soviet head of state, formed? There is no single answer: At the personal invitation of the USSR president, like Chingiz Aytmatov, a writer from Kirgizia; in competition with others, like urals worker Veniamin Yarin; or ex-officio, like the head of government, Nikolay Ryzhkov.

"We must get society more rapidly out of the sickly state in which it finds itself—Veniamin Yarin, who was nominated for the presidential council along with two others by worker deputies of the Supreme Soviet, told the TASS correspondent [no closing quotation marks as received]. Out of the three, Mikhail Gorbachev personally chose Yarin, who enjoys great influence in the workers' regions of the country. "In order to work out a policy which corresponds to the interests of the people, Mikhail Gorbachev needs unembellished, veracious information from the grass-roots, he said, and we are ready to provide it." Veniamin Yarin considers the chief task of the Presidential Council to be improving matters in the economy.

"I was personally invited by the USSR president, and I agreed after a great deal of thought, when I decided that I could be useful," said Chingiz Aytmatov, a prose writer of world renown, who enjoys authority in the USSR and abroad. Chingiz Aytmatov sees his main task in the Presidential Council to be in assisting the president of the country to formulate correct policy on the basis of his experience of life.

It is anticipated that the Presidential Council, which is designed, in accordance with the amendments recently introduced into the USSR Constitution, to "draw up basic measures to implement the main directions of domestic and foreign policy of the USSR and to ensure the country's security," will hold its first sitting today. The prime tasks of the USSR president's closest advisers, and the procedure of their work, are expected to be defined at this sitting.

Primakov Resigns as Council of Union Chairman

LD2803123390 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 28 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 28 TASS—Yevgeniy Primakov, who was appointed a member of the Presidential Council, today resigned as chairman of the Council of the Union, one of the two chambers of the Soviet parliament.

The council staff thanked him for his work and wished him successes at the new post.

A new chairman of the Council of the Union is to be elected today. Two candidates have been suggested for the post: Ivan Laptev, editor-in-chief of the IZVESTIYA newspaper, and Konstantin Lubenchenko, deputy chairman of Soviet Parliament's Committee for Legislation.

Draft CPSU Statutes Published 28 Mar

PM2703164390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 First Edition p 2

["Draft CPSU Statutes"—PRAVDA headline; boxed front-page introduction to the right of the masthead reads as follows: "As readers know, the draft new CPSU Statutes were discussed by the CPSU Central Committee plenum and approved in principle. On the plenum's instructions, the editorial commission and the Central Committee Politburo did additional work on the draft

statutes in accordance with the results of the debate and distributed the document to members of the CPSU Central Committee, and also to secretaries of republican, kray, and oblast party committees. The comments received from them have been taken into account, and the draft CPSU Statutes are being published for nationwide discussion"]

[Text] The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a self-managing sociopolitical organization, a voluntary association of like-minded communists. Built on the creative development of the ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin and operating on the basis of a communist perspective, it sets as its goal the creation of a humane, democratic socialism in the country and the establishment of internationalism and panhuman values. The CPSU rests on the socialist choice of the working class and all working people, expresses and defends the people's interests, and seeks to consolidate the multinational Soviet society on its political platform.

I. Membership of the CPSU

1. Any citizen of the USSR who has reached the age of 18, who acknowledges the party Program and Statutes, who works in one of its organizations, and who pays membership dues may be a member of the CPSU.

2. All party members are equal. They are entitled: to put forward and freely discuss questions of the party's domestic and foreign policy and intraparty life, to participate in the formulation of decisions, to elect and be elected to party organs at all levels and to monitor their work, to criticize any party organ and any communist regardless of the position he holds, to submit applications and proposals to any party body and receive a reply on the substance of the appeal, and to participate in the work of a party organ when the question of their activity or behavior is under discussion.

Membership of the CPSU does not give a communist privileges and does not restrict his civil rights and freedoms. He is entitled to participate in the work of social organizations and movements whose activity is based on the USSR Constitution and is not in conflict with the socialist idea. A CPSU member may not belong to other political parties.

3. A CPSU member has a duty to struggle to safeguard the party's vanguard positions in society, consistently to pursue its political line in labor collectives and among the population and in state, cooperative, and social organizations, to fulfill party decisions, to uphold and propagandize communist ideas, and to set an example of strict compliance with the rule of law and the norms of public morality.

4. Admission to membership of the CPSU takes place on an individual basis, democratically, and with glasnost. The decision on admission to CPSU membership is made by the primary party organization at an open meeting. The meeting's decision is final. A single party card is valid in the CPSU, and the procedure for registering party members is laid down by the CPSU Central Committee.

A CPSU member of at least 40 years' standing in the party, in view of his long, active work in the party, is, by a decision of the primary party organization ratified by the party raykom [rayon committee] and gorkom [city committee], awarded the honorary title "CPSU Veteran."

5. Membership of the CPSU is terminated by a decision of the primary party organization or higher party organ as a consequence of the expulsion of a party member from the CPSU for conduct that brings the party into disrepute or is incompatible with the requirements of its Statutes. A party member found guilty by a court of committing a crime is subject to expulsion from the CPSU when the verdict legally enters into force.

Party membership may be terminated on the basis of a party member's application for voluntary withdrawal from the CPSU; the said application is examined by the primary party organization.

A decision on admission to membership of the CPSU and on expulsion from the party is considered valid if at least two-thirds of those present at the meeting, but more than half of those registered with the organization in question, have voted for it.

The question of the expulsion from the party of a CPSU member who is on an elected party organ is examined at the primary party organization where he is registered or at the organization that recommended him for the said organ. Taking into account the opinion of the primary organization and with the participation of its representative, the question is decided at a plenum of the elected organ by a majority of two-thirds of the votes of those present at the session, making up more than half of the organ's members.

A person expelled from the party retains the right within one year, or at any time in the event of a change in circumstances, to appeal to party control and auditing organs. An appeal is examined within not more than two months of its receipt.

For violations of party discipline and ethics, measures of party education and influence may be applied to party members in the form of comradely criticism or a declaration of censure or a reprimand.

II. Intraparty Democracy

6. The CPSU lives and operates on the basis of ideological community and party comradeship, on the principles of self-management, combining the power of the party masses and the all-around democratism of intraparty relations with conscious discipline and organization on the part of communists.

Freedom of expression of opinion, the comparison of different views and platforms, and open criticism and

self-criticism are guaranteed in the party. Within individual organizations and in the CPSU as a whole, debates and referendums may be held on topical questions of the life of the party and country, and corresponding decisions adopted on the basis of the results.

7. Party organizations are autonomous as to the structure of their internal life and activity. Their decisions, provided they are not in conflict with the program aims and norms of the CPSU Statutes, may not be countermanded by higher organs, with the exception of decisions on personal cases.

8. The work of party organizations and committees is carried out by democratic methods and is built on the principles of collectiveness, ruling out subjectivism and autocracy. Collegiality in the formulation and adoption of decisions is combined with the personal responsibility of communists for their fulfillment.

Party organs form standing commissions on the main areas of work, and also set up ad hoc commissions and working groups and use other ways of involving communists and other citizens in their activity on a nonpermanent basis.

9. Party organizations, leadership organs, and their apparatus operate with glasnost, ensuring—in line with party decisions—the openness of party meetings, conferences, congresses, and sessions of committees and bureaus and the participation of the party press in them, and systematically inform communists and nonparty people about their activity through the mass media and through other channels. A communist is entitled to attend sessions of the bureau or party committee of his primary party organizations. Members of an elected party organ have free access to sessions of organs that are accountable to them, including party committee bureaus, and also have the right to make use of documents available to the party committee and its apparatus.

10. All leading organs in the party are elected. They are elected on the basis of a wide-ranging discussion of candidates and maximum consideration of communists' views, mainly on a multiple-choice basis, by secret ballot.

At election time party members have the unrestricted right to nominate any candidate, including themselves. A vote is taken on each individual candidate. Candidates are elected when they have obtained more votes than the other candidates and more than half of the votes of the CPSU members participating in the meeting, conference or congress delegates, or members of the party committee or other elected organs.

When nominating and electing delegates, communists propose candidacies for membership of superior party organs, that are then considered by the conference or congress that forms these organs.

Delegates to rayon, city, and okrug (without rayons) party conferences are elected in primary organizations. Elections of delegates to city and okrug (with rayons), oblast, and kray conferences, congresses of union republic communist parties, and the CPSU congress involve the compulsory nomination of candidates by primary party organizations, as a rule by a direct vote by communists. The election procedure is laid down by the relevant party committee on the basis of proposals supported by at least half of the communists in the given territory. A referendum or poll can be conducted to that end.

11. All elected people in the party, in raykom and above, are elected to the same post for no more than two consecutive terms. Members of elected party organs can be individually changed or they can all be replaced [pereizbratsya] before their term expires if one-third of the organization's members demands it or if individuals or all the members of the elected organs voluntarily resign.

First secretaries of party raykoms, gorkoms, okrug committees [okruzhkoms], and kraykoms, and the CPSU chairman and his deputies are elected at the relevant conferences and congresses. The ballot paper can include any number of candidates. During this process the procedure for the early replacement of these officials in the future is also established.

12. Party committees are accountable to their party organizations and superior organs. Party committee bureaus annually report to plenums and party committees and party bureaus report to meetings of primary and shop party organizations. Every member of an elected party organ reports on his work to the party organizations that elected or recommended him.

13. When making decisions, party organizations and committees are obliged to consider all viewpoints. The minority has the right to support its own position, record a minority view in the official record, and demand a repeat examination of disputes in their organization or place them before superior organs. At the same time, a decision made by the majority is binding on everyone.

In the executive organs of party committees (presidium, bureau), in the event of any disagreement a draft decision is resubmitted for repeat examination and adopted by a majority of at least two-thirds.

Party organs' decisions are binding on subordinate organizations. The latter are entitled to dispute them, by appealing to superior party authorities, without suspending the action of these decisions.

14. The party's leading elected organs establish their working apparatus that is subordinated to them and provides mainly analytical, sociological forecasting, and consultative backup for their activity. The party apparatus is established by the elected organ on the basis of primary party organizations' recommendations which

they discuss at their meetings. Party apparatus personnel are covered by labor legislation.

15. In implementing the party's cadre policy, primary party organizations and party committees recommend communists and nonparty people for specific sectors of state, economic, and public activity. Employing political methods, they seek their election or appointment to the posts in question, provide them with support, listen to communists' accounts of their work, and publicize ensuing conclusions and recommendations.

16. Party organizations are authorized to publish newspapers, journals, bulletins, and propaganda, reference, and information material in accordance with state laws out of their own funds or in cooperation with other organizations, and to establish editorial offices and radio and television studios for this purpose. The party mass media operate under the leadership of party committees, which confirm their leaders. The chief editor of PRAVDA is confirmed at a plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

III. Organizational Structure of the Party

17. The CPSU is built on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism along workplace and territorial lines and has the following structure: primary, rayon, city, okrug, oblast, and kray party organizations, and union republic communist parties. A party organization uniting communists of a given territorial entity is superior to its component organizations.

When necessary, councils of party organization secretaries, party clubs, theoretical seminars, discussion centers, and other forms of party work uniting communists on the basis of common interests or problems can be organized and operate. Proceeding from the CPSU program directives, they discuss various questions to define their positions, and submit proposals and drafts for consideration by party committees at any level.

The creation of factions with their own internal organization, discipline, and ideological principles incompatible with the party's program objectives is not permitted within the CPSU.

Primary Party Organizations

18. Primary organizations are the basis of the party. They may be created if there are at least three CPSU members at their place of work or residence.

A primary party organization may create party groups and shop organizations within itself. Depending on their size and with the permission of the party raykom or gorkom, they are granted the rights of primary organizations on questions connected with CPSU membership.

In light of the specific tasks and conditions of their activity, primary party organizations autonomously resolve questions of admission to the party and termination of membership of the CPSU, the definition of their structure, directions and methods of work, regularity of and procedure for holding meetings, political actions, and financial activity, and form mutual relations with soviet and social organizations.

Primary party organizations propagandize and implement the party's ideas and decisions, defend the principle of social justice, conduct political and organizational work in labor activities and local neighborhoods, and through the democratic mechanism of self-management exert their influence on the activity of cadres and the resolution of economic and social tasks.

Primary party organizations have the right to express their attitude on the decision of any party organ, which is obliged to give a substantive answer to it.

19. The supreme organ of the primary party organization is the general meeting (conference), which is considered competent so long as more than half of CPSU members (delegates) are present, or in the case of reports and elections, at least two-thirds .

For day to day work, the meeting (conference) elects an executive organ—the party bureau (committee) and its secretary—for 2-3 years. In party organizations with fewer than 15 communists, the party organization secretary and his deputy—and in party groups, the party group organizer—are elected for a period and in a manner prescribed by the meeting.

The primary party organization secretary represents it in relations with the administration, self-management organs, and social organizations in the labor collective and outside it. The question of the secretary's dismissal from the collective is subject to examination at a party meeting (conference).

20. Up to 50 percent of members' subscriptions is entitled to be used to finance the activity of primary party organizations, including the maintenance of full-time workers.

Rayon, City, Okrug, Oblast, and Kray Party Organizations

21. Rayon and city party organizations directly uniting primary party organizations are the pivotal structural link of the party. Rayon organizations in big cities may unite to form city party organizations.

The supreme organ of the rayon or city party organization is the conference. The conference elects the rayon or city party committee for five years and also the control and auditing commission. An extraordinary party conference may be convened by decision of the party committee or at the demand of primary organizations uniting at least one-third of communists.

In the light of primary party organizations' opinions, the rayon or city party committee elects the bureau and secretaries of the raykom or gorkom and creates their apparatus and material and financial base. The raykom

or gorkom registers primary party organizations, gives them necessary assistance, and keeps a record of communists.

Party raykoms and gorkoms coordinate and direct the activity of primary party organizations, help to strengthen their ties with the masses, join with them in explaining party policy and decisions, organize work in their implementation in labor collectives and citizens' local neighborhoods, present specific socioeconomic, cultural, and other questions for public scrutiny, and help to implement them.

22. Kray, oblast, and okrug party organizations take part in elaborating party policy and conducting work to implement it within the kray, oblast, or okrug, and organize the execution of superior party organs' resolutions.

The party conference is the supreme organ of kray, oblast, and okrug party organizations. Kray, oblast, and okrug party committees and control and auditing commissions are elected for five-year terms by the conference. Extraordinary conferences are convened by decision of the corresponding committees or at the demand of one-third of the total number of the organization's members.

Conferences, and also party committee plenums, that are convened as and when necessary, but at least twice a year, elaborate and propose to organs of state power and the population programs for solving political, ethnic, social, economic, ecological, and cultural-moral problems in the region. They examine questions of intraparty life, cadre work, the party organization's budget, and publishing activity.

Kraykoms and obkoms autonomously decide questions concerning the structure of their organization, including the formation of raykoms and gorkoms, and allow the largest primary party organizations to exercise the rights of party raykoms on questions of CPSU members' records.

Corresponding plenums elect the bureaus and secretaries of party kraykoms, obkoms, and okruzhkoms.

23. The control and auditing commissions of rayon, city, okrug, oblast, and kray party organizations elect bureaus and commission chairmen from among party members of at least five years' standing. The control and auditing commissions decide questions associated with the strengthening of party discipline and the observance of the norms of party ethics by communists, hear appeals by party members, and monitor the implementation of the party budget. Control and auditing commissions operate in conformity with regulations ratified by the rayon, city, okrug, oblast, or kray party organization.

Union Republic Communist Parties

24. Union republic communist parties are autonomous within the framework of the CPSU Program and the CPSU Statutes. They elaborate their own programs and normative documents, in accordance with which they decide their own organizational, cadre, publishing, and financial-economic questions, pursue their political line in the sphere of state building and the republics' socioeconomic and cultural development, promote the political consolidation of citizens and the combination of national and international interests, and shape internationalist awareness. Union republic communist parties maintain ties with other parties and social movements, including those abroad.

Fundamental decisions by the CPSU Central Committee Presidium and commissions affecting union republic communist parties are examined with the participation of their plenipotentiary representatives. In the event of disagreement with a decision that has been made, a union republic communist party central committee has the right to demand that a CPSU Central Committee plenum be convened to discuss any disputed questions.

25. A union republic communist party's supreme organ is its congress. Regular congresses are convened at least once every five years. They determine the political line, discuss reports by the central committee and the control and auditing commission, and recommend candidates from the union republic communist party for membership of the CPSU's supreme organs. Republic party conferences can be convened in the period between congresses.

CPSU Organizations Within the USSR Armed Forces

26. The activity of party organizations within the USSR Armed Forces is built on the basis of the CPSU Statutes and of documents ratified by the CPSU Central Committee.

Leadership of party work within the USSR Armed Forces is effected through party organs and primary party organizations. Party committees and primary party organizations resolve tasks in close collaboration with military councils, commanding officers, and political organs. They exercise their influence on the life and activity of military collectives through Army communists. The supreme party organ of the USSR Armed Forces enjoys the rights of a CPSU Central Committee commission.

Communists in the Armed Forces can elect and be elected to leadership organs of territorial party organizations. Delegates to rayon, city, okrug, oblast, and kray party conferences or union republic communist party congresses are elected at party conferences in military units and combined units according to the norms of representation laid down by the corresponding party committees.

The election of delegates from Army and Navy party organizations to CPSU congresses and all-union party conferences takes place at party conferences in military districts, groups of forces, fleets, combined units, and branches of the Armed Forces.

Note: Party work in KGB Troops, Internal Troops, and Railroad Troops is built along lines analogous to those in the Armed Forces.

IV. Supreme Organs of the CPSU

27. The congress is the supreme organ of the CPSU. Regular congresses are convened by the CPSU Central Committee at least once every five years. The Central Committee's decision to convene a congress, the agenda, and the representation norms are published no later than three months before the congress. The Central Committee publishes theses on the basic questions to be submitted to the congress.

Extraordinary CPSU congresses are convened by the Central Committee on its own initiative or at the demand of party organizations uniting at least one-third of the total number of communists. Congresses are convened within two months and are considered legally convened if at least half of all party members are represented at them.

In the event of the Central Committee failing to convene an extraordinary congress, the organizations demanding that it be held can form an organizational committee exercising the rights of the party Central Committee as regards convening an extraordinary congress.

28. The CPSU congress:

—hears reports by the Central Committee and the Central Control and Auditing Commission and adopts resolutions on them;

—adopts, revises, and amends the party program and statutes;

—lays down the party line in the sphere of party building, ideological activity, and the CPSU's domestic and foreign policy;

—elects the CPSU chairman and his deputies, simultaneously electing them members of the CPSU Central Committee;

—elects the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control and Auditing Commission.

29. In the period between congresses the CPSU Central Committee convenes, as and when necessary, all-union CPSU conferences to discuss pressing questions of the party's policy and practical activity.

A conference has the right to hear reports by the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Control and Auditing Commission concerning their work, to partially renew their composition (up to one-third in the period between congresses), to adopt other mandatory decisions for the party in the form of CPSU program documents, and to introduce amendments to the party statutes.

Elections of delegates to all-Union party conferences follow the same procedure as that applying to CPSU congresses.

30. In the period between congresses the party's activity is led by the CPSU Central Committee.

The CPSU Central Committee:

—organizes the practical implementation of CPSU congress and conference decisions;

—elaborates and submits to Congresses of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet proposals on the content of domestic and foreign policy;

—implements CPSU cadre policy;

—creates party institutions and enterprises and monitors their activity;

—represents the CPSU in relations with other parties.

31. In order to decide political and organizational matters in the period between plenums the Central Committee elects a CPSU Central Committee Presidium drawn from among its members. The presidium's members are ratified by the CPSU congress. The Central Committee Presidium also includes on an ex officio basis the chairman of the CPSU and his deputies and the leaders of union republic communist parties.

The CPSU Central Committee Presidium sends decisions to be carried out by party organizations on its behalf. The presidium submits decisions on the most important political issues for ratification by a CPSU Central Committee plenum.

The Central Committee Presidium annually submits a report on its activity to a CPSU Central Committee plenum.

Standing commissions are set up within the CPSU Central Committee on the main avenues of its activity. They are formed at a CPSU Central Committee plenum from among Central Committee members and other communists ratified as advisers. The commissions are headed by CPSU Central Committee secretaries elected by a CPSU Central Committee plenum, and are entitled to make decisions within their purview. Communists working on the CPSU Central Committee and its commissions on a permanent basis receive a salary paid out of party funds.

The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat is formed from the leaders of the commissions. It coordinates the activity of Central Committee commissions, organizes the execution in the party of decisions made by the Central Committee, its Presidium, and its commissions, and directs the work of the Central Committee apparatus.

During the period between Central Committee plenums, leadership of its organs' work is exercised by the chairman and deputy chairmen of the CPSU.

32. The CPSU Central Control and Auditing Commission elects at its plenum its bureau and cochairmen, who must have not less than 10 years' party experience.

The Central Control and Auditing Commission, guided by provisions ratified by a CPSU congress, monitors the fulfillment in the party of program documents, the CPSU Statutes, and decisions made by party congresses and conferences; monitors the state of party discipline and observance of the norms of intraparty life and party ethics; audits the implementation of the CPSU budget and the financial and economic activity of the CPSU Central Committee and its institutions, enterprises, and publishing houses; and examines appeals against expulsion from the party.

33. The CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Control and Auditing Commission hold at least two plenary sessions a year and, if necessary, joint sessions.

CPSU Central Committee members can participate in the work of CPSU Central Control and Auditing Commission plenums and members of the Central Control and Auditing Commission can participate in the work of CPSU Central Committee plenums on a nonvoting basis [s pravom soveshchatelnogo golosa].

Communists elected to the CPSU Central Control and Auditing Commission cannot join other central elected organs of the party.

V. Communists in Soviets, Public Organizations, and Movements 34. The CPSU and all its organizations operate within the framework of the USSR Constitution and Soviet laws. Party organizations and committees do not permit mixing of functions with state and economic organs, and pursue the party's policy line through the communists working in them.

The party cooperates with all social forces advocating positions of democracy and social justice and opposes antisocialist, nationalist, and anti-Soviet forces. It bases its relations with trade union, youth, and other sociopolitical organizations and mass movements on the principles of political collaboration and partnership and respect for different viewpoints.

35. The CPSU, like other sociopolitical organs, struggles for political leadership in society through free elections and other forms whereby Soviet citizens express their will. Party organizations elaborate and publish their election platforms, recommend communists for nomination as candidate people's deputies, and help them to organize their election campaigns.

Party organizations can enter into election agreements with other social organizations and formations operating on the basis of and in accordance with the Constitution and can support candidate deputies nominated by them who are not CPSU members.

At congresses and sessions of Soviets of People's Deputies and congresses and conferences convened by social and cooperative organizations where communists are members, communists unite in party groups to coordinate their activity and increase party influence. Party groups are guided by Soviet laws and the decisions of the relevant party committees.

36. In their work with young people party organs and primary party organizations rely on the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] and other youth organizations that support socialist choice; give all possible assistance to their activities in educating young people; and involve them in elaborating and implementing the CPSU's youth policy. The relationship between party and Komsomol organizations is founded on ideological commonality, recognition of the Komsomol's organizational independence, mutual respect, and comradely trust. The party sees the Komsomol as the immediate reserve for replenishing its ranks.

VI. The Party's Property and Monetary Funds

37. The activity of the CPSU and its organizations is carried out using financial, material, and technical resources provided by party income.

The party's property and monetary funds are partywide assets. Facilities owned by the CPSU include buildings, installations, party publishing houses and the property of the periodicals and printing houses under their jurisdiction, enterprises, and other property, as well as monetary funds composed of membership dues, income from party enterprises, and other revenue.

The party budget, the normatives for payments by local party organizations, and the procedure for the redistribution of funds are ratified by a CPSU Central Committee plenum and published in the press.

Monthly membership dues for party members are as follows:

Incomes of up to R70—10 kopeks
R71-100—20 kopeks
R101-150—30 kopeks
R151-200—1 percent of salary
R201-250—1.5 percent of salary
R251-300—2 percent of salary
R301-350—2.5 percent of salary
over R350—3 percent of salary

Working communist pensioners pay their party membership dues separately on their pension and on their salary.

38. Union republic communist parties and kray and oblast party organizations have independent control over their budgets in an attempt to boost income so as to secure the transition to self-financing, and they resolve structural, staff, and financial matters. Profitable economic and commercial activities by party enterprises and institutions that do not run counter to the interests of political work and Soviet legislation are encouraged.

Local party and control and auditing organs systematically inform communists about the state of the party budget and the expenditure of funds.

'Democratic Platform' Arguments Rebutted

PM2803105390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

["Polemical Notes" by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences A. Yakovlev; published as part of the feature "Discussion Page No. 18": "What the 'Democrats' Want"]

[Text] In my view, the ideological and theoretical standard of the document drawn up by the theoreticians of the Democratic Platform does not match the demands of the present day. They accuse communist ideology of dogmatism without noticing that they themselves are sinking into the mire of... dogmatism.

One of the symptoms of dogmatic thought is the categorical nature of opinions, the impermissibility of a different perception of the question under discussion. With what impassioned intolerance they attack democratic centralism—the fundamental principle of any party (not necessarily just the Communist Party), thus demonstrating their neodogmatism in all its magnitude.

"The chief cementing link of the undemocratic nature of both the party itself and the entire political platform is the principle of democratic centralism." Then follows devastating criticism. Let us take a look at how convincing it is.

"Democratic Centralism:

"a) does not ensure genuine pluralism of opinions in the party or the possibility... of criticizing adopted decisions." For one thing, this is at variance with practice—pluralism does exist and criticism of decisions and party leaders is flourishing as never before;

"b) does not ensure the protection of the rights of the minority which... generates innovative ideas, and thereby dooms the party to constant stagnation." This claim also diverges considerably from established practice. Sometimes we are in such a hurry to accommodate minorities that we come to regret it afterward. It is necessary to listen to minority opinions, to respect them, but it is not worth putting their importance above all else. Experience gained in the course of perestroyka has shown that minorities by no means always generate progressive ideas.

"c) prohibits the creation of horizontal ties...." This is another dogma which is not borne out by practice. The scientific, professional, cultural, sports, and other associations, including political organizations, in which communists are active—are these perhaps not horizontal ties?

"d) dictates iron executive discipline...." A party without discipline is an amateur association rather than a political organization. Ultimately it is doomed to fall apart and fail. Press articles following the publication of the Democratic Platform have shown that the platform's champions themselves by no means scorn tough disciplinary measures, including in questions of ideological and theoretical procedure;

"e) does not allow CPSU members who are elected people's deputies to express the will of their voters as opposed to the will of higher party organs." Another claim which does not correspond to established practice. The CPSU Central Committee does not impose its will on communist deputies. Many of them express completely freely their understanding of problems which frequently differs from the opinion of the CPSU Central Committee. It is not difficult to see this for yourself, you only have to read the published stenographic records of the Congress of People's Deputies and USSR Supreme Soviet sessions.

All the criticism leveled at democratic centralism is based on experience which has by now been rejected by the party, it does not correspond to the realities of the present day and is behind the times. It denies the existence of healthy norms of intraparty life without adducing proof, and supplants them with the dogmas of anarchism and total license as convincingly borne out in the proposals of the Democratic Platform for a radical reform of the CPSU.

Here is another example: "The CPSU parliamentary party obtains extensive autonomy in its activities and is subject only to the party congress." Even an incorrigible bureaucrat would not have thought up such an absurd assertion. The whole of present-day life reflects the unprecedented dynamism of social processes. The political or economic situation can change in a matter of hours. Does this mean that in such circumstances the CPSU Central Committee is not even able to express its own opinion? Or is it assigned the role of a consultant whose opinion need not be heeded? Is it necessary to wait for a congress, which is convened once every five years? The parliamentary party would turn into a bureaucratic monster. After all, the parliamentary party is formed by the voters, not the party. Does this mean that the party has no control over it? How would this differ from a latter-day "Order of the Knights of the Sword?"

The authors of the Democratic Platform propose a seemingly highly democratic procedure for electing leading party organs at all levels: It is necessary "to introduce direct elections of primary party organization and of rayon and city party committee secretaries, of party committee members, and of party forum delegates with multiple candidacies, on the basis of election platforms, in secret ballot, and with free nomination of candidates." The attraction of this proposal is its seemingly democratic character. However, the experience of the past report-and-election campaign has also revealed the reverse side of this method: It has unleashed the initiative not only of the conscientious, but also the philistine forces in the party. There are plenty of the latter. As a result many party organizations have lost mature, firm, and principled secretaries who have been

replaced by people favored by the management, and in some cases by the shadow economy wheeler-dealers. Unless provision is made in the CPSU Statutes for equal rights of party committees in questions of the selection of the party aktiv, the measure proposed by the Democratic Platform could result in many cases in a weakening rather than a strengthening of party committees.

"It is necessary to completely and unreservedly condemn the model of state socialism which has driven our society into a profound crisis," the authors of the Democratic Platform demand. I agree that the model of state socialism has outlived its usefulness and that it should be replaced by a more democratic social system. But are we not throwing out the baby with the bath water? Without trying in any way to justify state socialism, and especially the dreadful crimes of Stalin's clique, let us ponder the historical facts. After all, it was state socialism which made it possible to create a leading industry in a backward agricultural country, win a most difficult war against world fascism, and restore the national economy, rebuild devasted cities and villages, and raise the country from the ashes within an unprecedentedly short time. It has also enabled our people to achieve considerable successes in scientific and technical progress.

Here is another example of the antihistory thinking of the authors of the Democratic Platform. They write: It is necessary "to restore the freedom of factions and groupings and of ideological currents by repealing the 10th Russian Communist Party (bolsheviks) [RKP(b)] Congress resolution "On the Party's Unity." In theoretical terms factions inside the party are permissible and there have been quite a few of them in the history of our party. But what is the situation as regards factions in practice? When, at what point in history, are they expedient, and when are they impermissible? After all, Lenin was not opposed to factions prior to the 10th congress, he even favored their freedom and regarded them as useful. Then suddenly, out of the blue, comes the resolution "On the Unity of the Party" banning factions. What was this, a manifestation of Lenin's dictatorial ambitions, a deviation from democratic standards within the party? Suppression of dissident thought?

Today many critics of the party, of Lenin, and of socialism see the congress resolution as a manifestation of precisely these phenomena and are trying to maintain that Stalin's repressions are rooted in the resolution adopted by the 10th RKP(b) Congress on Lenin's initiative and with his direct participation.

The critics are cheating. They omit to mention the specific historical conditions in which the resolution on unity which banned factions was adopted. It was a matter of life or death of the revolution, it was a question of whether the Bolsheviks would manage to hold on to power or whether they would be swept away by petit bourgeois elements. Unshakable unity of the party was essential. The resolution on unity was not a manifestation of antidemocratic aspirations on the part of Lenin and the Bolsheviks but a forced deviation from democracy within the party, a deviation made necessary by terrible, pernicious circumstances.

Now about the present-day circumstances. Do they permit freedom of factions? The authors of the Democratic Platform gave their assessment of the current situation in our country. In their view, the country is in the grip of a most serious crisis. Would freedom of factions be expedient in these circumstances? The establishment of factions and the organization of their work would absorb a great deal of intellectual, organizational, and material resources. The result would be a further exacerbation of the grim situation in the national economy and the consumer market. This is because the factions would, I am convinced, channel their efforts into firmly establishing their role and place, (or to put it more simply, their ambitions) within the social structure rather than attending to the development of production. Few people have pondered why in all the Baltic republics production of almost all types of consumer goods has diminished, judging by the results of 1989. One of the reasons is that the people's fronts and the new parties and other political organizations which have sprung up in these republics have focused their main efforts on purely political issues rather than production tasks. The same would happen with the factions whose revival the Democratic Platform is advocating. The logical impact of factions, which is corroborated by worldwide experience, is that they weaken rather than strengthen the position of parties, irrespective of whether we are talking about a bourgeois or a communist party.

Putting all their efforts into the struggle against the party and its ideology, the compilers of the Democratic Platform have failed to notice that they have exposed their true nature: They omitted to mention in their political document such a "trifle" as the vital interests and needs of the people. No reference is made to these in the platform. It is, of course, possible to find excuses for this "omission," claiming that these interests are implicit, that all factions are set up to express the interests of specific social groups. However, no matter what explanations are thought up, the fact remains that the interests of the people have been "forgotten" in the Democratic Platform. There is a certain logic in this: The main aim of a new faction or party is to survive, to stand its ground in the struggle for a place in the sun. The simplest way to achieve this aim is by means of attacks on existing political organizations, while the interests of the working people are used in these circumstances merely as a means to satisfy ambitions.

Incidentally, this is clearly evident also in Yu.N. Afanasyev's remarks at a session of the "roundtable" organized by the journal DIALOG and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, where he said: "I have been told more than once of late that there is no room in the party for people like me. In principle, I fully agree with this. There really is no room for me in what is currently described as the CPSU.... Why am I a member of the CPSU? I see my main task in rallying members on the

'Democratic Platform within the CPSU.' We must work out with what and how we can approach the 28th CPSU Congress. But we may not succeed in this. It is possible that an alternative congress will be necessary for those who proceed from the Democratic Platform."

It is well known that the whole secret of success in politics is the achievement of the maximum satisfaction of the material and spiritual interests and needs of the people and their mobilization and unification for the purpose of the satisfaction of these needs. In order to preserve and enhance the prestige of our party it is necessary to advocate its cohesion rather than the establishment of factions and parties (I am convinced of this!). If the party succeeds in rallying the people around vitally important interests, it will grow united and strong itself. If it concentrates on a struggle among factions, it is bound to disintegrate. But maybe, this is what the authors of the Democratic Platform are after?

KGB Official Denies Yeltsin Claim

PM2203135190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Letter by Yu. Kornilov, chief of the USSR KGB Sverdlovsk Oblast Directorate published in URALSKIY RABOCHIY: "'Statement for Press'"]

[Text] "Recently B.N. Yeltsin's speeches and interviews have contained complaints against the USSR KGB Sverdlovsk Oblast Directorate and its chief; that is, against me. In a recent interview with the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY (No. 9, for 3-9 March this year) in particular he accused me of preparing 'on instructions from above' memoirs of the period when he worked as first secretary of the CPSU Obkom [oblast party committee].

"In making this statement Boris Nikolayevich was obviously misled by unconscientious informers pursuing some aims of their own. I received no such 'orders from above.' I have never written, am not writing, and do not intend to write any memoirs, particularly not with a view to discrediting anyone whatsoever: These unscrupulous methods are repellant to my convictions as a communist and my ideas of the honor and duty of a citizen and Soviet officer."

[signed] Yu. Kornilov, chief of the USSR KGB Sverdlovsk Oblast Directorate (URALSKIY RABOCHIY, Sverdlovsk)

KGB Archive Material on Display

LD1603233290 Moscow TASS in English 2002 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Yelena Prikhodko:

The USSR State Security Committee, often reproached for its archives being inaccessible to public scrutiny, has released some of them for the "Reputations Restored" exhibition which opened in Moscow's History Museum today.

The exhibition is about the destinies of victims of Stalin's purges during the 1930s and the 1940s and in the early 1950s—ordinary Muskovites, prominent statesmen and well-known art figures.

The cooperation between KGB officials, former political prisoners and the exiled as well as members of the "Memorial," a historical and educational society founded last summer, is a measure of the changes that have taken place in society. Many photographs of the construction of the Belomorskiy canal, where most workers were political prisoners, are shown for the first time.

The enormous damage done to the nation by Stalin's lawlessness can be measured by the destinies of Vladimir Antonov-Ovseyenko, a prominent party figure; the outstanding scientist Aleksandr Chayanov whose economic theory now attracts universal attention; Academician-Physiologist Fasily Parin; Sinologist Mikhail Fortus, then rector of the university of the working people of the Orient; the gifted air pilot Konstantin Artseulov, and Martin Latis, director of the Moscow Institute of National Economy.

Those people's personal files, photographs, personal belongings and correspondence with friends have left the archives for the first time. Side by side with an aluminium spoon and a quilted jacket—preserved by prisoners who survived and were subsequently rehabilitated, are a graceful little box with make-up, sketches of known characters, and small sculputured portraits.

These attest to the unbroken spirit of actors who organised an underground theatre in the camp, of painters and sculptors. A painting by Robert Falk, a well-known Soviet painter and former inmate, was given for the exhibition through the Soviet Cultural Foundation by his daughter who resides abroad. Touching family relics give us a sharper realisation of the great individual tragedies of the victims of purges, be they government members or ordinary cizizens.

Frolov Talks to KGB Leaders, Activists

LD2403205490 Moscow TASS in English 2040 GMT 24 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 24 TASS—Leaders and party activists of the central offices of the USSR State Security Committee (KGB) met the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Ivan Frolov, who is editor-in-chief of the PRAVDA newspaper.

In his address to the meeting Frolov dealt with the pressing issues of perestroyka, the development of democratization and glasnost in the life of Soviet society and the communist party. He responded to numerous questions.

Moscow Worker Deputy Speaks on Candidacy

PM2603123790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with people's deputy V.A. Gololobov by S. Skorokhodov: "Decided Not To Withdraw"]

[Text] My interlocutor is Vladislav Andreyevich Gololobov, fitter at the Moscow-Sortirovochnaya locomotive depot and the sole Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] deputy representing the workers of Moscow. A contradictory fact, you will agree, requiring serious and profound analysis. Our conversation began with an an attempted explanation of it.

[Skorokhodov] Vladislav Andreyevich, I am told that a year ago you were nominated as a USSR people's deputy. You withdrew your candidacy. Why?

[Gololobov] That is true. I decided that a worker would find it difficult to assume such a burden. It is not exactly a piece of cake working in the supreme organ of power of a vast country! I mean that then, as now, there was no shortage of highly educated economists, lawyers, and other defenders of the people's interests. So I withdrew.

[Skorokhodov] What has made you change your attitude now?

[Gololobov] Another year has passed. It has shown that life has not become any better or any brighter for me or for the people around me. In fact, the problems and difficulties have increased. When I share my thoughts and observations with workers I see that I am not the only one who is worried. The parliament, which is made up mainly of intellectuals, has not yet eradicated the mistakes. In fact, it seems to me that very many parliamentarians regard debating as more important than action. When the nomination of candidates began in the new election campaign, there was a survey at the depot. Most of the workers named me again.

It was all this, together with the fact that I am by no means a shy man, that shaped my decision. Enough of this talking about dismantling the bureaucratic-command system and doing nothing about it. In our railroad transport system it is merely adapting all the current economic innovations to its own needs—and not only here, I suspect. Here is an example for you: Last year our depot paid 37 percent of the profits it earned to the superior organ. This year 49 percent has already gone that way. Although we fulfilled all the economic indicators and did a very good job last year, we ended up broke and still cannot pay the workers their 13th month bonus—there is no money! Yet year after year we have talked about the need to pay in accordance with the end result, depending on the profit that has been obtained. We have earned the profit but others have received it.

I have been around, argued, told people that it is bad management practice to slap a worker's wrists for working better. But orders are stronger that perestroyka at the moment.

[Skorokhodov] In this connection, what elements in your program do you regard as creative, as holding the key to solving the crisis in which society finds itself today?

[Gololobov] My motto is social justice—always has been, always will be. We have too many wretched people living in unfit accommodation, without household amenities. How can these people devote themselves to their work and create something of high quality? How can people who are below the poverty line, receivng R70-75 per month, find living conditions that are fit for human beings? Russia must take the lead in tackling these questions, if only because it is the richest republic. Russia has everything that human beings require in order to exist. It only exports, and what does it get in exchange? Nothing, in fact. We have become whipping boys, to blame for everything, wherever it happens....

I believe that it is necessary to establish a cult—I am not afraid of the word—of the law at the first stage of the Russian parliament's activity. That is, conditions are needed in which together and individually we respect and execute laws. It is the their nonexecution that I regard as the cause of many problems. I believe that it will be one of the main tasks for our new deputy corps to establish order in the country. But this is an enormously difficult task, because its solution depends on mutual relations between republics, regions, and so on.

We must emancipate the soviets. Create conditions whereby they can take charge in their own territory, having not only the right, but also the economic potential to do so. The relationship between local organs of power and enterprises must be changed. Economically independent soviets will do everything the inhabitants of an area need.

Two laws are vital: on the socialist enterprise and on taxation. So that people will know what they are working for.

[Skorokhodov] Vladislav Andreyevich, you are a non-party person. Do you think this made your election struggle easier or harder?

[Gololobov] I don't think it was that that made a large proportion of the voters to vote for me. I have been at the depot for 25 years. Most of the workers are familiar with my production, invention, and rationalization activities and my work in the social sphere. When I was nominated as a candidate for RSFSR people's deputy I received a majority of votes at workers' meetings and the depot conference....

[Skorokhodov] Do you foresee any problems in the fact that you are the sole representative of the Moscow working class?

[Gololobov] Of course, there will be difficulties and problems. It goes almost without saying that we must abandon all the old principles, ideas, initiatives, and traditions. Indeed, we are being criticized for being loyal to the traditions of the "Red Saturday." In our pledges

for this year we have decided to hold a subbotnik. But the money we earn will be used to set up a fitness center at the depot.

[Skorokhodov] Your second-round rival in the 42d Permskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Yu.N. Arkhangelskiy, got barely half as many votes—the will of the voters was unequivocally expressed. Does this mean that the election struggle in the okrug was not a tense one?

[Gololobov] Not at all. There was a veritable leaflet war throughout Perovskiy Rayon after the first round. There was a very vigorous campaign against me. Who was conducting it? I do not want to blame a specific club, society or candidate, but there were leaflets signed by the Perovskiy Rayon voters' club and the "Democratic Russia" bloc. To be honest, I was very surprised. Russia's torment and hopes, its economic independence, its rise and the revival of its culture are all in my program. Yet the "democrats" accused me of "cosying up to the apparatus." Where is the logic in that? Or does the bloc believe that the only democrats are those who march beneath their banner?

I am advocating unity of those forces which express the interests of the entire people, of working people who are tired of waiting for real changes. A life fit for human beings has to be the common desire of all Russian parliamentary deputies.

Deputies Comment on Republic Secession

90UN1212A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 11, 17-23 Mar 90 p 4

[A. Uglanov report on proceedings at Special Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies: "Nationality Problems as the Deputies See Them"]

[Text] Today the question of the introduction of presidential rule in the USSR is on everyone's lips, as they say. This is a complex and largely contradictory problem. It was reflected also in the keen debate between deputies and in their platform speeches. But, nonetheless, the decision has been made, and time will tell whether the new institution of power is an effective instrument with which state power will rid itself of the paralysis in which, according to Deputy S. Alekseyev, it finds itself.

Each day is literally crammed with events, and although important, the question of the presidency is not the only one. The awakened self-awareness of the nations and peoples populating our union poses other tasks as well. The most important is the very existence of the USSR as a union of 15 equal republics. It was interesting in this respect to hear deputies' opinions on the possibility and evaluation of such an act as the secession of a republic from the USSR.

B. Oleynik (Ukraine). This is a natural process because it was thus modeled by us from the top, from the bottom and horizontally. But I believe there is no need to rush. It is possible to live in the present federation a little longer. But the right to secede is guaranteed by the constitution.

The main thing for the Ukraine, I believe, is winning higher authority in the world community. We need to show that it will do everything to make other peoples feel at home. I know what I am talking about because I have seen how national discord ends. And, God forbid, if this were to happen on our scale and spread—break out—on a Russian scale, both sovereignty and the environment would be covered in blood, and there would be no questions then.

B. Gidaspov (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic). My view. Of course, this fact would be undesirable in itself because, say what you like, this would disrupt the wholeness of the economy. But if such is the will of the people, what can we do.... They will secede, and this cannot be prevented.

A. Khusanov (Uzbekistan). We are not supporters of secession from the union. We do not intend this and are not ready for this. If you take the Central Asia regions, we do not intend this, are not thinking of this. And are giving others—the Baltic republics, Georgia—the same advice.

Understand that for us this is unacceptable. For the last 40 years these republics—the Baltic republics—have been taking our raw materials for pennies. Processing our raw material, they have made R30-40 per kilo of fiber for cloth and shirts. The profits have remained with them—a large part in the union budget also. For 40 years they have grown rich and become prosperous. They consider themselves to be at the world level, but us, backward.

We have made the following demand. Let them settle accounts with us for the 40 years in which we have been fleeced, excuse the vulgarity. Then let us see who takes up their cause—Sweden, Finland, or America. No one will because they would have nothing.

If they behave thus, we will cut off supplies and demand that the government supply them with nothing. We will ourselves determine our prices at the world price for cotton.

T. Chkheidze (Georgia). Each republic has the right to self-determination and the right to decide its own, internal questions. But this is not that easy. The desire is understandable, but the point is that we are so interconnected that this cannot be done immediately. But, in general, the desire of each nation to self-determination can only be welcomed. In my opinion, everything is moving toward the need to create precisely a union of free republics.

M. Abasov (Azerbaijan). We do not have this problem. It is altogether unrealistic, proceeding even from merely economic considerations, considerations of management. There is no such issue on the immediate agenda in

our republic. I believe that there will not be such at all. Following the changes which are proposed, the serious sovereignty of the republic will, I believe, be consolidated, and there will be no such questions.

E. Lippmaa (Estonia). We are not in the federation. We cannot secede. That's all there is to it. We are not in the federation on a legitimate basis. We are simply not listed—that's the point.

M. Vulfson (Latvia). As far as the three Baltic republics are concerned, I am speaking at a time when Lithuania has detached itself from the USSR. I believe that the two other Baltic republics will go this route also. Why do I speak so guardedly—we have in this respect a more complex demographic composition of population. Naturally, this process will be for us more complex, possibly.

Both in Latvia and in Estonia the absolute majority of the indigenous population is attuned toward state independence. In order that it be perfectly clear what we understand by the word "statehood." The nucleus of this understanding is that we must once again be a subject of international law and the international community. That is, this is a state with its own representations abroad concluding agreements with foreign states—commercial and political.

As far as all the rest is concerned, it is a question of benevolence and mutual civilized discussion between us and the union. The mood in Latvia and Estonia is undoubtedly that we would like to unreservedly have good relations with the union. We could be a connecting link between the union and the West.

Second, on defense matters each republic has its own point of view. My personal view is that the military bases could be preserved, that is, the Soviet Union's defense interests respected. Having reached strict agreement, however, that there would be no interference in our internal affairs on the part of the USSR Armed Forces, which would be stationed in strictly designated areas. Communications would be preserved. Ports we would definitely reach agreement on.

This is just a small fraction of the immense variety of the deputies' opinions. Each of them is undoubtedly right in his own way—and is it possible to combine their thoughts and aspirations and bring them to the point of uniformity?

Perhaps the president will deal with this? In any event, world experience affords us a last chance to resolve the accumulated contradictions democratically and without punitive measures and to "sweep the mines" which were laid dozens of years ago beneath all of us.

Leading Cadres Study Ethnic Relations Problems

PM2603094590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Attention Focusing on Ethnic Relations"]

[Text] Everyone is worried by the present state and future prospects for the development of ethnic relations in our country. A series of political, organizational, and legislative steps are being taken today to implement the renewed nationalities policy.

A 10-day seminar-conference of officials from union republic cOmmunist Party central committees and from kray, oblast, and okrug party committees was dedicated to questions concerning the training of cadres working on ethnic problems. It was held in the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Institute for Improving the Qualifications of Senior Party, Soviet, and Ideological Cadres.

The training process gave special attention to the implementation of the party's and the state's nationalities policy in present-day conditions. There were debates and exchanges of opinions on questions of developing the Soviet federation, giving it a new content, and delineating the powers of the USSR and the union republics, as well as on the rights of nations and human rights, the dialectics of the national and the international, and the common historical destinies of the country's peoples. There was a keen discussion with representatives of the press on the mass media's role in the coverage of ethnic problems. There was also a broad discussion of the Russian Federation's problems and of its position and role within the USSR.

The participants were addressed by V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A.V. Vlasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers; G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A.N. Girenko and G.I. Usmanov, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee; R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities; I.O. Bisher and B.I. Oleynik, deputy chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities; V.V. Chikin, member of the CPSU Central Committee RSFSR Bureau and chief editor of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA; V.M. Falin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; V.A. Mikhaylov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ethnic Relations Department; and by leaders of ministries and departments, writers, scientists, and journalists.

Hidden Pressure on Lawmakers Alleged

PM2203162290 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 11, 18 Mar 90 p 14

[Supreme Soviet member Nikolay Fedorov article: "Still Trying To Influence the Law-Makers Are Those Who Should Implement the Laws. The Discussions Backstage Are Quite Often More Significant Than What Is Done Openly"]

[Text] Several times, returning home from sessions of the Supreme Soviet, I watched anew, like an onlooker the progress of the session on TV. I caught myself thinking that I was looking at a sort of a show, the finale of which is known to the actors.

You suddenly see a strong and a competent deputy all of a sudden reverse his stand. The uninitiated TV watcher is confused—how could that happen? Because on the TV he is not shown those plush offices beyond. The parliament, in which the compromises are made. I'm not going to give specific examples here, but sometimes a change in the deputy's stand is hard to be explained by anything except backstage pressure. I myself was subjected to it. Everything I write is my personal experience.

As a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, I found myself on the Committee on Questions of Law-Making, Legality, and Law and Order, and became the head of the working group on the draft Law on the Press. Our first step, which surprised our patrons from the apparat of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet very much, was to reject the anonymous draft Law on the Press approved by the Ideological Commission and Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, preferring to it the draft initiative by Baturin-Fedorov-Entin, a group of young scientists from the institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Last July the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet on questions of glasnost and citizens' rights recommended publishing the working version of the draft law in the Zhurnalist magazine, so as to get the opinions of professionals. The text had been already set at the printshop. But the editor-in-chief didn't dare sign it for printing without getting the agreement of the CPSU Central Committee. I had to go to the chief of the ideological department, A. Kapto. I tried in vain to convince him for three hours; however, the set type was discarded. Today the CPSU Central Committee Plenary Meeting put in its platform that the party would struggle for the soonest possible adoption of the Law on the Press (which one?), but half a year ago the ideological department of the Central Committee was in no hurry at all.

Still, work on the draft went on. It was approved in two committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet—on questions of legislation and questions of glasnost. After that we passed it on to the printshop of the USSR Surpeme Soviet to be printed and distributed among the deputies.

The session was going on, the time for discussing the Law on the Press in the first reading was drawing near, but there was no printed law. As the leader of the working group I had to apply to A. Lukyanov, but I learned from him only that V. Medvedev would like to speak with me and I had to go and see him. I was surprised—why should I visit him and he not visit us, if he was interested in the draft law on the press, even though he didn't take part in preparing it. Lukyanov convinced me by saying that Medvedev was also a full-fledged people's deputy of the USSR.

We went to Medvedev in Staraya Square—four of us—deputies G. Shakhnazarov, K. Lubenchenko, A. Sebentsov and I. We spoke for some three hours. Medvedev's arguments boiled down to two questions—should citizens be included among the possible founders of mass media, and should we refuse so absolutely preliminary censorship? Essentially, he was proposing a new edition of the draft law in two of its very fundamental points.

I objected that the draft was already approved by two committees of the Supreme Soviet, in which similar alternative proposals were considered, but not a single deputy supported them. Saying good-bye I asked Medvedev if it was possible to distribute the draft among the deputies now. He sort of agreed. But the printed draft was distributed only several days later.

As the leader of the working group I was preparing to make a report at the session on the draft Law on the Press. Only a day before, this seemed to be in order. But on the morning of the day when the report was to be delivered Shakhnazarov told me that he'd be delivering the report himself "on the request of the leadership." In his report the meaning of Articles 6 and 43 was changed. The articles were not included in the draft law that was distributed among the deputies. The correction of Article 6 proposed excluding citizens from the founders of mass media, and in the correction of Article 43 (in the printed version it became Article 42) it was said that not only founders but publishers may interfere in the affairs of mass media.

I'm not against alternative corrections to draft laws, as long as they are introduced by the deputies directly during the discussion at the session, and it is clear to the deputies who made the corrections. Besides that, the introduction of parliamentary corrections presupposes that they are immediately put to a vote, which wasn't done. As a result of the voting, the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted the version without any amendments. I'm not sure that all the deputies realized what happened even after the text was published in Izvestiya with the corrections that appeared from nobody knows where. Strictly speaking, no one had the right to publish these corrections.

Of course, we see definite progress in the direction of the ideals of a law-making state: Before, the CPSU Central Committee directly composed the laws, now draft laws are only slightly corrected. But the apparat gradually applies ever new methods of backstage pressure on the law-makers, striving to restore or preserve the priority of bureaucratic executive power over legislative power.

After the Law on the Press was adopted on its first reading, an attempt was made to neutralize any influence on its fate by the more active deputies. The law did not go back to the Supreme Soviet Committees for reworking, and the working group was liquidated. The Presidium decided to set up a commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to rework it.

Included in the commission, alongside the deputies, were a considerable number of leaders of interested departments—the head of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, chairman of the State Committee on Book-Printing, and other high-ranking leaders—all without deputies' mandates. A number of deputies who before were not at all interested in this draft also got on the commission. I've got the impression that an organ obedient to the Presidium apparat was being formed.

At the very first meeting of the commission, Yefimov, chairman of the Committee on Book-Printing, started by saying that it was necessary to build up a mechanism to prevent materials harmful to the state from "seeping into" the press. He was supported by Samoshchenko, first deputy minister of justice of the USSR. Essentially, they spoke—refuting everything that had been done before that in committees—of restoring basic censorship of the Glavlit type, defined very broadly and vaguely.

What about the committees on questions of glasnost and legislation? They now must formulate proposals on the basis of the nationwide discussion which has taken place, and to "report" to the Presidium's commission. I protest firmly against this. The commission is not a constitutional organ, but at best a deliberative body. In spite of this, it has been put above the constitutional committees of the Supreme Soviet.

Of course formally, the deputies have the decisive word—they vote and not the apparatus. But when and how the draft is presented at the session, and the comments made on it are of crucial importance. The Presidium will now be referring in everything to the "commission." Not all the deputies are abreast of all the fine points in all the draft laws, and for them the opinion of the "commission" will be quite "impressive." There do exist tested methods of influencing voting results through party discipline.

For example, during the first congress, A. Petrov, first secretary of the Chuvash Regional CPSU Committee, who was elected unopposed in a rural constituency, assembled every morning the entire Chuvash delegation of 18 people in a Rossiya hotel room, and gave them a sort of a briefing. You know, he said, this is all so new and unusual.... Therefore, when voting, look at the presidium and at the chairman (at the time voting was still done manually).

When we were leaving for the second congress in December, Petrov brought us together in cheboksary. He told is that the inter-regional group was fighting "for Soviets without communists." The idea of briefing us was not the brainchild of A. Petrov.

It is probably natural that a political party take measures to ensure that all its members vote in a certain manner and support definite decisions. I suppose the parties in French or West German parliaments do the same thing with their deputies at sessions. But there, different deputies gather in different studies, and in our country—practically everybody is packed into the same room. The very sense of parliamentary work gets lost—of discussion and voting. Why not, in such case, decide everything at the CPSU Central Committee Plenary Meetings as was done before?

What kind of pluralism of opinion in a parliament can we speak about? Real pluralism is absolutely vital for normal legislative work. Monopoly in legislation costs us no less than monopoly in the economy. A multi-part system would be of great benefit not only at elections, but also when the draft laws go through parliament. We'll get good laws only when they undergo tough competition.

It is a most important task to speed up the professionalization of the USSR Supreme Soviet. When it is composed completely or for the most part of full-time experienced parliamentarians, then the possibility of the apparat bringing pressure to bear on us will be greatly limited. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet must become, as it is said in the Constitution, a working organ of the Soviet and not the other way round. And for the future we should consider whether we need it at all.

'Panic' at Publishing House Over Paper Shortage

PM0603112190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Mar 90 p 1

[T. Borisov report: "Hurry Up and Read the Newspapers While There's Still Some Paper"]

[Text] An almost incredible situation. Apparently the PRAVDA publishing house—the biggest in the country—will soon be unable to cope with its functions. The reason is simple: There is a shortage of paper. The publishing house workers are in a state of panic. Long gone are the halcyon days when USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] norms specified that there should be a 45-day contingency reserve in case of unforeseen interruptions in supplies. The publishing house is currently operating "from hand to mouth." On the day this item was being put together there was still no paper to produce the next issues of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, SOBESEDNIK, ZA RUBEZHOM, SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, and many others. We were told at the publishing house that a freight train was stuck somewhere out near Khovrino station and that if it did not arrive by nightfall the newspapers would not come out the next morning.

"It all began with USSR Council of Ministers instructions under which paper producing plants were given the right to retain five percent of their output for themselves," L. Zhuravleva, deputy chief of the Paper Department at the PRAVDA CPSU Central Committee Publishing House, said. "Our suppliers in Solikamsk, Balakhna, and Kondopoga can now, quite legally, not provide planned supplies. We are in danger of not receiving 51,000 tonnes of paper, which represents 45 working days for the publishing house. In Ulyanovsk and Kharkov many newspapers already come out late, and

we are printing some newspapers in arrears. I can never remember a situation like this year. If things go on like this we will simply not be able to operate."

The paper makers have a different attitude. For them this five percent gives them at least some slight chance of rectifying their calamitous situation.

Such is the gravity of the imbalance in plans that has developed in such a dynamic field as the newspaper business. It is difficult to predict what will happen next. Just one thing is clear: The publishing house must operate normally and smoothly, and, since this is a state matter, the government must sort it out.

Trade Workers Said To Smuggle Goods to Poland

PM2203101690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Mikhail Ovcharov report from Ivanovo under the rubric "Hot Line": "A Case of Smuggling"]

[Text] The organs of state security in Ivanovo Oblast have begun an investigation into the smuggling abroad of goods by workers at the general depot of the oblast potrebsoyuz [Union of Consumer Trade Cooperatives].

You might wonder how there could be any kind of smuggling in the heartland of Russia, far from the state borders. The explanation is that the developing direct links of the oblast's enterprises and organizations with foreign partners have led to the opening in Ivanovo of a post of Moscow central customs. People who love to make a quick profit have not been slow to take advantage of this. As B. Tolmachev, section chief at Ivanovo Oblast KGB administration, explained in an interview with the oblast newspaper "RABOCHIY KRAY," officials of the oblast potrebsoyuz general depot, without the knowledge of customs organs and without registering a declaration, sent television sets and household electrical goods to a Polish cooperative organization. In exchange boxes containing clothes, footwear, and tights arrived in Ivanovo in containers carrying food. These items were put on sale without the appropriate paperwork.

An investigation is in progress, and many questions still await answers, but much is already known. For instance, the workers of the oblast potrebsoyuz generously, if illegally, handed over to their Polish trading guests a considerable sum of money for "out-of-pocket expenses" and sent them expensive presents—at the taxpayer's expense—in the form of painted samovars and washing machines. When they went to Poland, the Ivanovo citizens got hold of "souvenir" items for colleagues in the shape of vodka, cognac, caviar, sweets.... For services rendered? This will be established by the investigation.

Economic

Petrakov Interviewed on Soviet Economy

PM2803071090 Paris LE MONDE in French 24 Mar 90 pp 1, 41

[Interview with Nikolay Petrakov, economic adviser to Mikhail Gorbachev, by Bernard Guetta in Moscow—date not given]

[Text] Moscow—[Guetta] Will the "radicalization" announced by Mr Gorbachev become a reality?

[Petrakov] I think so. I would like it to because it is important to understand that this concerns the economic system itself; the transition to a market economy. The question is no longer what to do but how to do it, because our situation is unique.

For 70 years, we have destroyed the market and we must now move from the absence of a market to a market economy.

In the past, there were many ideological barriers, in that the socialist system, as you know, was designed to be the opposite of that market. The barriers have now been removed.

The president has said that it is necessary to move forward, without fear or complexes, but I am an economist not a politician. I see the need for the market, but at the same time, I see the problems....

[Guetta] Have decisions been made? Will they soon be announced?

[Petrakov] There is a government program comprising a number of measures aimed at strengthening the financial system, extending autonomy, and reorganizing the banking system. We have been thinking about all that for a long time, but we are moving too slowly. Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that our current problems stem from the fact that we are between two systems, the bureaucratic system and the market. We must move from the first to the second. We have already started the journey but we are still in flight. We must land.

Creating the Conditions for Competition

[Guetta] And what will be the landing procedure?

[Petrakov] If we are really to move toward the market, we must resort to very serious measures. In this connection, many (Soviet—LE MONDE editor's note) economists are very impressed by the reforms introduced in Poland, by Mr. Mazowiecki's shock treatment. Consequently, they think that prices must be unrestricted, enterprises be given greater freedom, and that that will be enough to ensure that the market brings us happiness.

I think that is very naive, because the first thing to do before unrestricting prices is to create the right conditions for competition, without which there can be no price freedom. One of the first measures to be taken is

therefore to demonopolize our economy, which is the most highly monopolized in the world because, in addition to technological monopolies, there are organizational monopolies—the ministries and very big enterprises, such as Intourist and Aeroflot which are well-known abroad. However, to split Aeroflot into several companies, for instance, all we need is the political will. It is very easy to break organizational monopolies.

The ministries (Mr. Petrakov was talking about ministries which head branches of industry—LE MONDE editor's note) only exist because there is no market, of which they are really the complete opposite. If the enterprises could obtain supplies on the market, they would not need them and they understand that. We must therefore change from a system with ministries to a system of joint stock companies. All enterprises should be turned into joint stock companies, with shares which could be freely bought and sold, and available to individuals, enterprises, and banks, including foreign banks.

[Guetta] Will that happen?

[Petrakov] I would like it to.

[Guetta] Would you buy shares in Soviet enterprises?

[Petrakov] (Joking at first—LE MONDE editor's note) If it is a mixed company, yes, why not? (Becoming serious again—LE MONDE editor's note) You know, it depends on the dividends, whether or not they are higher than the interest rates.

[Guetta] But the Soviet people do not even know what a share is!

[Petrakov] We will have to explain it to them.

[Guetta] How could all this be done in practical terms?

[Petrakov] Very simply. The legal provisions are very easy to imagine. I do not see any problem, and if you are really asking me: "Is this really possible?" I would answer that many things, for instance a multiparty system, seemed impossible five years ago.

[Guetta] How will you go about it? Will you put everything on sale and wait for retired people to get their rubles out from under the matress?

[Petrakov] Listen, we can naturally envisage some enterprises being transferred to private ownership, but, forgive me, you are talking as a Westerner. It would be difficult for me to imagine how an individual could become the owner of an enterprise's capital, simply taking a majority holding, when it takes him five years to buy a car.

People will be able to buy shares but we are thinking of something much more serious. Let us take the simple example of Aeroflot and take the situation in which that company needs money to buy new planes. At present it turns to the State Planning Committee [Gosplan] to ask for roubles or foreign currency if it is considering buying airbuses, for instance.

The Gosplan officials meet, study this request at the same time as others put forward by other sectors, and make their decision... usually a bad decision. If instead we have joint stock companies, our Aeroflot will only have two sources of finance aside from its profits—the sale of shares or a bank loan.

There will be no state intervention, absolutely no state intervention, to help enterprises to invest and, if shares are issued, we will therefore have accumulated capital and started an investment process corresponding to the laws of the market. The main obstacle on the road to the market is the excessive monopolization of the investment process.

[Guetta] And to open this road to the market, you therefore want to eliminate state investment? Is that the key principle?

[Petrakov] Yes, absolutely. The creation of a fairly balanced product market is not a very difficult thing in itself. We know the prices which would make it possible to put meat on the shelves. If you go to the peasant markets, there are supplies and their prices are known.

However, this rebalancing of the market is not the creation of a market mechanism which presupposes that if your revenue is large you can rapidly develop because capital goes where profits are highest.

In our country, since all profit returns to the state and is redistributed according to administratively defined priorities, there is no growth in production.

Reducing State Investment

[Guetta] So, will there be no state investment at all?

[Petrakov] I did not say that. We must start by reducing state investment but maintaining it in spheres like space, education, healthcare, defense, and aid to orphans, the handicapped, and all the weakest members of society. But we must stop all other state investment and, as regards education and healthcare, the state should only provide a free service up to a general level. Anything more than that must be paid for or funded by trade unions or other movements.

[Guetta] How did you become the president's economic adviser?

[Petrakov] It surprises me even now. I had never had a private conversation with him before he summoned me on 17 December to offer me this position. My first meeting with him was in 1984 before he was general secretary. He had brought together several economists and experts. Since then, I had seen him several times but at seminars, with 50 or 100 people. I had addressed them as an expert on the market. I had been working since

1965 at the Central Economics and Mathematics Institute, of which I had been deputy director since 1969. (Since the sixties, this institute, the TsEMI, has been a great center of liberal thinking which was the cradle of several of the current new political groupings—LE MONDE editor's note).

[Guetta] So, once you have started to demonopolize, what is the second step?

[Petrakov] This raises the question of inflation, the accumulated inflation stemming from decades of a dogma according to which the real struggle against inflation was rigid price control. This control was exercised but without any control of incomes which, in our country, increased very rapidly, especially because the state was stimulating them with grandiose and unproductive projects.

In a normal economy, that would have led to an increase in prices and, because our economy is not normal, the money supply increased—the amount of "pretend money" with which people can do nothing, which they cannot use. Other countries have experienced the same phenomenon and in the USSR we have 165 billion rubles in savings, a good half of which is simply enforced savings—not preparation for investment but mere accumulation dictated by the impossibility of buying or investing.

In Eastern Europe, as soon as prices were unrestricted, those enforced savings flooded into the stores and prices followed. We must take account of this experience and preventively divert this money supply to new spheres of investment, in the form of apartments, country houses, industrial shares and, of course, savings with interest. With this in mind, interest rates must be increased from the current two percent to eight or 10 percent.

People must be given the chance to use their money for the development of individual production. This must all be done before unrestricting prices and the only other exceptions to this unrestriction should be a few strategic or essential products—at most 20 or 30 products.

No to Monetary Reform

[Guetta] So, to absorb this money, there will be no monetary reform, no reissue of banknotes....

[Petrakov] Some people maintain that we should do that, explaining that this money is the product of the shadow economy, the black market, and mafia activities. My analysis is entirely different. The people in the parallel economy have known for longer than the economists that this money is worth nothing. They have not kept it. They have bought antiques, foreign currency, pictures, and therefore this money has been dispersed throughout all sections of the population among perfectly honest people. If the state seized it overnight, that would be unfair.

[Guetta] To sum up, there are three stages: demonopolization, the diversification of individual investment opportunities, and the unrestriction of prices. Is that the case?

[Petrakov] You are forgetting an important point: the reduction in the size of monopoly enterprises which should give rise to several competing companies. For years we believed that big enterprises were better than small companies—the bigger the better as a premise of investment policy—and we must now create competition because where there is none we will have to maintain price control.

[Guetta] Unrestriction of prices means a major drop in living standards. Will there be compensation?

[Petrakov] We have, of course, thought about that. For the poorest people, incomes will be indexed to prices. That is very important. We must defend the poorest people, but this will be very difficult because, until the economy has become efficient, the possibilities of channeling money into social spending will be limited.

At all events, we will encounter a psychological problem because the people are not accustomed to the harshness of market laws, to competition, and to the differentiation of incomes. Even before the revolution, there was a tradition of egalitarianism in Russia which has obviously been strengthened during the Soviet period.

The cooperatives, which were an initial step toward the market, were therefore not accepted by a large section of the population, and under pressure from those people the government was forced to limit their activities.

[Guetta] So, how can we hope that the measures proposed will be accepted?

[Petrakov] It will be much easier to have them accepted. People will continue to work in the same enterprises without at first even realizing that they have become joint stock companies. As before, the employees will receive wages, and the market will only affect them later. Some will receive more, some less, others will experience unemployment but, psychologically, it will be more acceptable....

[Guetta] When will the ruble be convertible?

[Petrakov] On this subject, I have a view which the bankers do not share. I think that our economy should be open because although we have shown for years that we could develop in a closed system, we have also shown that the results were not conclusive. We must now join the world market and take part in the international division of labor. Everybody would gain from that, especially the West, because this will be a unique chance of establishing a world market.

The Convertibility of the Ruble

[Guetta] In fact it would be a market covering only half the world. It would be a northern market....

[Petrakov] A northern market? Yes, perhaps....but the obstacle to this integration is nonconvertibility. We should normalize our monetary system. Everybody agrees, but some people think that it can only be done when we have an efficient economy.

I think that we will not achieve that without a convertible currency, because it is only with the aid of Western technology and Western capital that we will be able to improve the situation. However, if our market is to be very attractive, it must look like a market. The problem for Western enterprises is to know what to do with the rubles earned here. We now need a special convertible ruble for joint enterprises and Soviet enterprises which are capable of responding to competition.

We must tackle this immediately and organize a foreign currency market within the country enabling us to buy and sell it freely. We have a relatively large amount of foreign currency, around $15 billion per year—the fruit of our exports. We have hitherto invested it in a centralized way. Enterprises must be able to buy it to invest.

[Guetta] It take years, or at least months to introduce such changes....

[Petrakov] We must change the budget and the fiscal system.

[Guetta] So, it will take a long time....

[Petrakov] Why are you so cautious? Let us try to have a little imagination. We are deciding to change the method of redistributing profits, of no longer taking what we took from enterprises. If we do not alter the budget and the tax system, the state will have no revenue. But why not change the whole thing at the same time, let us say tomorrow, at the end of the month, or on the 15th of next month? After all, the starting date of a budget period is only a convention. We have hitherto thought in five-year periods.

[Guetta] Indeed, but such changes require either parliamentary decisions—one year's debate at least—or presidential decrees, which would be risky....

[Petrakov] You should work in Gosplan!

The aim of the economic reform is to introduce democracy into the economy. I like the market because it is a democratic system. And what is democracy in our country if not the state handing over the job of management and hence responsibility to the actual producers?

[Guetta] Why not say: "I no longer want to lead you?" If Mr. Gorbachev did everything you are advising him to do overnight and by presidential decree, he would be taking personal responsibility, before the whole USSR and for at least 10 years, for the running of the whole economy. That is difficult. Is he prepared to do it?

[Petrakov] I do not know. But if I were him, I would be prepared to do it. Is there any alternative?

[Guetta] Precisely. If you were not fully heeded, what would the minimum measures be?

[Petrakov] We must set things moving (for a real economy—LE MONDE editor's note) by buying consumer products from abroad funded by a reduction in our wheat imports. In fact, it is just as easy to directly buy good quality meat than to feed poor animals at great expense. Similarly, we must buy fewer machine tools and more manufactured products and invest in joint enterprises rather than import what they could produce here.

Creation of 'Free Economic Zones' Planned

LD2403230190 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 23 Mar 90

[By TASS corrspondents Aleksandr Fedorov and Georg Mikhailin]

[Text] Moscow March 23 TASS—Plans are being drawn up in the USSR to create free economic zones of various types in Armenia, the Leningrad region, the Far East, Moscow, Novgorod, Poti, Sochi and Uzhgorod, Sergey Lavrov, deputy head of the foreign economic relations department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, told TASS today.

He stressed that Soviet authorities were pinning on them their hopes to speed up the development of separate regions and branches, to increase production and export potentials, to make a technological breakthrough and to master various ways of introducing new methods of economic control and management.

Lavrov believes that the free economic zones will promote the improvement of people's living standards, because they can help increase currency revenues and meet doemstic demand for consumer goods and services.

Vladimir Grigoriev, head of a section of the department, said that, as a rule, easy terms are introduced in such zones for all kinds of economic activities of national, joint and foreign enterprises and their own currency mechanism is created. This is why free economic zones are a more advanced form of attracting foreign capital and finding ways of cooperation between Soviet and world economies than joint enterprises.

Numerous meetings with reprsentatives of Soviet enterprises, foreign businessmen and U.N. experts show that free economic zones can become an instrument of the Soviet economic reform, provided a correct and balanced attitude to them is worked out, Grigoriev stressed.

Decision To Cancel Volga-Don Canal Viewed

PM2703140590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by IZVESTIYA special correspondent Ye. Manucharova under the rubric "Returning to a Previous Item": "From a Sea of Lies to a Field of Rye"]

[Text] The 10-year struggle over the construction of the Volga-Don II canal has ended in a victory for science. The USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan] State Expert Commission [SEC] has adopted a resolution which "recommends the mothballing of the construction of the canal to allow for the completion of work under way to construct social facilities."

The department's claims for R2 billion for the project were deemed unlawful. They were defined as unwarranted promises to "feed the region" as soon as the canal is commissioned. The recoupment period suggested by the planners was deemed unrealistic: It would take much more than 20 years.

The conclusions arrived at by the Gosplan experts are confirmed by decisions of the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection, USSR State Committee for Construction experts, the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry, and the USSR Academy of Sciences. People's deputies representing people in the Volga area also demanded that Gosplan immediately halt construction. A broad popular movement arose as a protest against the actions of the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. A committee to protect the Volga was set up. The people's irreconcilable stance served as an extremely important argument for the SEC in its objections to the construction.

The experts' tours had shown that the population was not exaggerating the ecological danger of new canals. The state of affairs had also been correctly evaluated on the farms: There is no need at the moment to establish new irrigated areas in order to obtain more agricultural products in the Don-Volga mesopotamia—all that is needed is get the existing farms and their land into proper shape. The irrigation systems that were constructed in the past are of poor quality and one-third need to be reconstructed. The arable is in a bad state. Yields are extremely low on land that is already under irrigation. For instance, potato plantations provide less than one-third, grain fields 18 percent, and vegetable plantations only 14 percent of the planned yields. The number of major facilities for the storage of products is small and entirely inadequate. For example: Farms have only 15 percent of the refrigerators they need. The inadequate infrastructure is leading to harvest losses. Experts have calculated that they amount to R1 billion. Given such incompetent management, it makes no sense to irrigate thousands and thousands more hectares.

There is another reason why the canal is harmful: the state of the Volga itself. In order to persuade the country that water can be permanently removed from the Volga basin, the creators of the canal included in the plan an unrealistic account of the river's water balance. But experts claim that in five years' time the spare volume will not only be totally exhausted, but there will already be a negative balance. And this will also spell death for the Caspian.

So the SEC's decisive conclusion was that "obtaining additional agricultural products on newly irrigated land through the construction of the Volga-Don II canal cannot at present be regarded as a priority area for the development of the agro-industrial complex."

But why is this only being written now, and not when the canal was originally thought of? Why did it take so long for common sense to reveal itself?

Let us consider the history of it. For seventy years the country was obsessed with giant projects and the cult of the future. The departments geared their expansion to this convenient ideology. As a result there emerged an idea whose deleteriousness is obvious today: that agricultural problems would be solved by diverting the northern rivers to the Volga, whose waters would spill over onto the Don-Kuban mesopotamia, thereby establishing one million hectares of artificially irrigated land—in the next century. In 1981 the SEC adopted a technical and economic scheme (there was no plan) for the Volga-Don II canal. Although it did specify an essential condition—that the waters of the Volga should be swelled and the canal should be brought into operation only if the entire "plan of the century" is fully implemented.

The department immediately started digging, without waiting for the canal plan to be made and approved. It did not let up even when the massive diversion of the northern rivers was prohibited by a CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decision. Scientists (including Gosplan experts), aware that it was inadvisable to interfere with nature on such a grand scale, had accumulated weighty evidence. And life itself was providing clear and persuasive evidence of the hazardous nature of the actions of the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources.

But canal construction continued.... It was then (a year ago), at an SEC session, that experts presented evidence that the construction was ecologically unsafe and economically inadvisable. Moreover, the country does not have the billions the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources is asking for. The final decision was not taken at the time. The formal reason was that the SEC had not been presented with the entire plan, just the ecological part. But what was the real reason? Many interests were affected by the new decision. And it was unusual.

A year later the SEC was compelled to look again at the plan—with allegedly new explanatory material. The department claims had been sharply reduced, in terms of the volume of water and amounts of money and land required—it had all been cut by nearly two-thirds. But they failed to deceive the experts. At the last session it was shown that the new parameters for the canal would also be much more costly than the documents indicated.

So it all ended well: The claims on the Volga were prohibited.

What now?

At the SEC session the experts said that more than R100,000 million had been spent even before the project was authorized. Who is going to compensate the state for the losses? Volga and Don land has been excavated and river banks have been disfigured. Who is going to heal these wounds? The thousands of people who worked on the canal have wasted years of their lives. Who can bring them back? The Volga people are in a state of agitation; for a long time they have been uncertain about the future and about justice. Who is going to compensate for the moral cost?

The Volgograd public is now demanding ecological judgment on the creators of the canal. Should one be surprised about this or resist it? After all, it is hard to be a peaceful farmer without saying to those who have raped the land: "It is a long way from a sea of lies to a field of rye...."

Gold Mining Associations To Halt Work, Disband

LD2703091590 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] About one-third of all Soviet gold mining associations have decided to stop work or are about to disband. They made this decision in the wake of the government's decree on fixing new purchasing prices. The new prices are so low that they make gold mining unprofitable. According to economists, if these prices are not altered, all gold mining associations could curtail their activity and the country will fail to receive about 50 tons of the precious metal annually as a result.

Agricultural

Early-March Weather, Crop Conditions Outlined

904B0169A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 Mar 90 p 2

[Article by Kh. Tebuyev, agricultural meteorologist: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Unusually warm weather continued in the European territory of the USSR. Average air temperatures everywhere exceeded the long-term average by 5-11 degrees. Then it turned somewhat cold. Winter grains and perennial grasses grew over the entire 10-day period in farms of the Ukraine, Moldavia, North Caucasus, and Lower Volga region. Their condition is primarily good to fair. There was mainly 130-160 millimeters of productive moisture in the one-meter layer of soil under winter grains; the southwest Ukraine had 70-110 millimeters. Vegetation was noted for these crops on certain days over most of the territory of Belorussia and the Central Chernozem region. In the remainder of the European territory of the USSR, winter grains were in a state of dormancy. In the eastern North, northern Volga-Vyatka, and Ural regions, where the depth of the snow cover has reached 35-65 centimeters and more, snow-smothering continued with respect to the winter grains. Over the remaining territory, the period of winter dormancy was basically favorable for the winter grains.

The results of plant growth seen in samples taken from the fields by meteorology stations on 20 February confirm a significant thinning out, especially of winter rye, in the predominance of territory in the northern, northeast central, northern Volga-Vyatka, and western Urals regions due to snow-smothering, and in the southern Volga-Vyatka, central, and northern Volga regions—due to the intense cold observed the first half of January. In the Baltic and northwest regions, increased thinning out of winter rye was noted as a result of soaking and sharp fluctuations in air temperatures. The winter wheat crop basically survived the winter dormancy period favorably. The greatest percentage of plant thin-out was observed in the southern oblasts of the central region. Plant samples also perished (up to 20 percent) in the northeastern central Chernozem region.

The beginning of the 10-day period was warm in the Transcaucasian republics. Winter grains and perennial seeded grasses grew here over most of the 10-day period, and the buds of fruit varieties continued to swell and open.

In the agricultural regions of Siberia and Kazakhstan, weather conditions were observed to be unusually warm for this time of year. The average air temperature for the period was 8-12 degrees greater than the long-term average. As of 10 March there was snow cover everywhere except in southern Kazakhstan. Winter crops in Western Siberia were in a state of winter dormancy under snow cover.

Average air temperature in the Central Asian republics over the 10-day period was two to six degrees higher than the long-term average, while the southeast of the territory came close to it. Here the buds of fruit varieties continued to swell and open. In the southern regions of Uzbekistan and Turkmenia, and in the valley regions of Tajikistan, apricot trees were noted to be blooming.

Agricultural Developments for 8-14 March

LD1503030790

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian from 8-14 March. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parenthesis at the end of each item.

8 March

No significant developments.

9 March

In Saratov Oblast the area sown with corn is to be expanded to 250,000 hectares and the area sown with sorghum is to be expanded to 140,000 hectares. (0700)

10-11 March

No significant developments.

12 March

The RSFSR Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] has provided a round-up of the results of the work of vegetable and potato growers in the RSFSR over the past year. Some 33.5 million tonnes of potatoes and 11 million tonnes of vegetables were harvested. However, procurement points received only one fifth of the potatoes collected and two thirds of the vegetables.

The supply of cabbage, onions, and best beet also fell. But the purchase of tomatoes, garlic, and carrots rose somewhat. The prescribed plan for the supply of all types of produce from plant-growing was not fulfilled by farms and procurement organizations in Orel, Saratov, Rostov, and some other oblasts, Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays, Kabardino-Balkariya and Checheno-Igushetiya. The plan for the supply of potatoes and vegetables to Moscow and Leningrad was not fulfilled. (1200)

13 March

Around 150,000 hectares has been sown with early spring crops in the Kuban to date. (1900)

14 March

No significant developments.

Scientific

'Cosmos-2063' Satellite Launched 27 March

LD2803080890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0725 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 28 Mar (TASS)—The latest artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-2063, was launched on Tuesday [27 March] in the Soviet Union by a Molniya carrier rocket.

The satellite carries scientific apparatus for continuing space research.

The satellite has been placed in a highly elliptical orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution 11 hours 49 minutes; apogee 39,346 km; perigee 602 km; orbital inclination 62.9 degrees.

Besides scientific apparatus, the satellite carries a radio system for the precise measurement of orbital elements, and a radiotelemetry system for transmitting to earth data about the work of the instruments and scientific apparatus.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

The coordinating and computing center is processing the incoming information.

Cosmonauts Conduct Experiments Aboard Mir

LD2703131190 Moscow TASS in English 0931 GMT 27 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent from the Mission Control Centre]

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin have now spent six weeks aboard the Mir orbiting station.

Today they will carry out technical, geo-physical and medico-biological experiments, as well as compile an inventory of the life supporting system's stocks.

In accordance with the programme for medical research, the two cosmonauts will undergo a medical check-up to assess the state of their internal organs with the help of ultra-sound.

They are also planning the "Rezonans" experiment to estimate the dynamic characteristics of the orbiting station.

The cosmonauts have pumped fuel, brought by the automatic cargo ship "Progress M-3," into the tanks of the united power plant of Mir.

They are continuing to re-equip the station with additional devices and installations. On Monday, the cosmonauts assembled a new stationary camera Kap-350 for geo-physical research in the Kvant-2 module. The camera will be tested today together with the station computer.

The flight is going on normally and the cosmonauts are feeling well.

Military

Yazov, Lizichev Address Army Writers Meeting

PM2803115790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

["Our correspondent" report: "Meeting With Writers"]

[Text] A meeting with writers whose work and lives are associated with the Armed Forces, and who recently formed their own Officers' Assembly of Writers, was held 24 March in the USSR Ministry of Defense and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

Army General D. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and minister of defense, addressed the meeting. In his brief speech, he described the complex situation in which the Armed Forces are operating at present. He dwelt on the role played by fiction and the mass media in the spiritual life of soldiers and officers.

Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, told those assembled about the implementation of proposals made by writers at their previous meeting.

Alarm and concern with the state of affairs in society, the groundless attacks on the Armed Forces, and the mass media's inadequate activity in defending the interests of servicemen, were voiced in speeches by writers A. Prokhanov, N. Doroshenko, F. Chuyev, S. Lykoshin, I. Kurchavov, K. Rash, Yu. Vinogradov, A. Fomenko, and Major General V. Filatov.

Those assembled were unanimous about the need for a truthful depiction of processes occurring in the Army and of its role and position in the life of society and the people.

Military Official Interviewed on Desertions

LD2703213390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1040 GMT 27 Mar 90

[From the "Armed Forces and Society" program presented by Aleksandr Korshunov]

[Text] Good day, comrades. The spring call-up to the Army and dismissal of those citizens who have served for the set period is now getting off the ground. In other words, those special relations between society and the Armed forces are emerging as a good many representatives of that society leave their civilian life behind for a while and others return to theirs. Things have developed so that the call-up campaign which takes place twice a year has been regarded as a national holiday and, at the level of public awareness, it was seen like this for a long time. Life makes its own alternations, however. We have to talk about the altered attitude to military service as an actual fact. That numerous cases of desertion from the Army, refusal of the call-up, destruction of military documents and draft cards have been registered since the well-known events in our national republics can only cause alarm. Even in those areas where the situation has always, as a rule, been favorable, in Russia, Ukraine and Belorussia, for example, the number of objectors [otkazniki] has significantly increased. For example, last autumn alone, 6,500 people refused the call-up.

It is about the situation that has arisen and its possible consequences and causes that my colleague, correspondent Sergey Guryanov talks to Leonid Alekseyevich Smertin, a representative of the Main Military Procuracy.

[Begin recording] [Guryanov] Can you tell me, please, why there is such a large figure? Is it a manifestation of the painful growth of our democracy?

[Smertin] I don't think democracy has anything to do with it. There have always been people who evaded the military call-up. It is another matter that we never encountered this fact in such large numbers. According to the available data, 6,500 conscipts evaded the autumn call-up. A definite problem emerges in connection with this for the forthcoming spring call-up. You know, in order to solve or correctly understand the reasons for this manifestation, we have to look at the situation at one remove, as it were. First, in my opinion, the fall in the prestige of the Armed Forces is significant, to a certain extent. There are features in the press and on television and radio on this subject, and criticism aimed at the Armed Forces.

[Guryanov] Excuse me, but isn't this criticism, let's say, quite fair to a great extent?

[Smertin] To a great extent it is, yes. And I am not denying that, but the very fact of it—just think, never before were the Armed Forces criticized. They were always valiant, so to speak, and highly organized, always on guard. Then suddenly, of late, a flood of harsh criticism has swept over the Army. Naturally this weakens those people who must go into the Army to fulfill their duty under the constitution, while it makes others totally opposed to military service because the question is raised as to whether service in the Army is expedient at all, whether it is necessary. Discussions are held regarding a professional army. That is on the one hand.

On the other, there is a certain number of young people who do not want to do their service and do not want to go through the difficulties and deprivations which exist, whatever one may say. It's hard to serve in the Army. Of late, various informal movements, organizations, and groups, etc. have started to have a great influence on the call-up problem and especially in the republics of the Caucasus, the Baltics, and Moldavia, which have started very active propaganda campaigns to the effect that there is a need to create their own national military formations. In this way the conclusion is drawn from this that there is no need to serve in the USSR Armed Forces. These then are the three main reasons, in my view, and they have led to a situation in which we have so great a number of draft-dodgers.

[Goryanov] Leonid Alekseyevich, tell me please what the law has to say regarding those who evade conscription.

[Smertin] The law is quite definite: if military service in the ranks of the Armed Forces is an obligation of honor—and I stress, of honor—it is nonetheless an obligation: and the law stipulates liability for evading that obligation and, what's more, criminal and fairly strict liability. Given that this liability is stipulated, the actions we often see now, that is all this theatrical burning of service cards and draft cards or putting them in coffins, etc., is, I would say, in the nature of psychological pressure on the authorities. The law is valid, no one has repealed it and so the person, the conscript who evades the call-up, will, under the law in force, be charged for it. Someone who burns his service card will, again under the law in force, be fined for it. Someone who evades military service will be criminally liable for this crime. This should be remembered by conscripts,

their parents, servicemen, and the leaders and emissaries of the various organizations which are, basically, provoking young people into disobeying the law and effectively pushing them toward the sword of criminal liability. In a state based on law, there has to be compliance with the law. That is one of the principles of such a state and if we want to build one we must, above all, guarantee observance of the law and compliance with it by everyone, with no restrictions or exceptions.

[Goryanov] Leonid Aleksayevich, you know that it has now become very fashionable when discussing things to refer to Western, civilized experience and to the democratic institutions of the Western states. Of course, there is a grain of reason here. Let's look at that experience and tell me, is criminal liability stipulated in states in the West for evading military service and desertion?

[Smertin] You know, it all depends on the principle of staffing the Armed Forces. If it is a question of an Army staffed along principles of military obligation, then of course there is liability for evading service. If we are talking about voluntary staffing, then such liability becomes problematic. All the same, for desertion as the gravest form of evading service, there is liability in all armies. [end recording]

Former Colonel Examines CPSU Platform

90UM0366A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Article by Professor V. Vdovyuk, retired colonel and doctor of pedagogical sciences: "Are We Not Engendering Eroded Ideas?"]

[Text] Moscow—While expressing, as a whole, a positive attitude toward the CPSU Central Committee Platform and noting its consolidating impact on the party and society, I would like to express a number of specific observations. In my view, and I have been a member of the party for over 40 years, certain questions need to be more precisely worded.

First, there is a certain discrepancy between the title of the platform and the name of the party itself. Our party is a communist party, but the platform speaks only of socialism. Today, alas, the explanation that socialism is a lower phase of communism convinces far from everyone.

Second, a convincing conceptual interpretation of the very concept "toward humane, democratic socialism" is needed. And it is not a question of definitions here. It is well known that in the period of Stalin's personality cult and in the years of the Brezhnev stagnation the idea that socialism is the "most humane, most democratic socio-economic and social and political system" was repeated constantly. Yes, socialism cannot be an inhumane and undemocratic social system. If there is in fact such a system, this is, excuse me, not socialism but some conglomerate, with individual, at times incidental, attributes of a socialist nature.

Third, the draft platform portrays the CPSU's ideological and educational activity inadequately and is not sufficiently convincing, in my opinion. It is important to consider this when the final touches are being added if the party, having renounced the constitutional right to the leading role, intends to assert its leadership and mandate of governing party in a system of political pluralism.

If, on the other hand, the CPSU is really abandoning the "communist schooling" concept, it is necessary to explain the objective need for such a step. This question is as yet open.

And, further, I am surprised, to say the least, that there is no room at all for the "schooling" concept in the proposition concerning the development of education, enlightenment and culture. Yet it is primarily a question of the fate of the younger generation and its political, spiritual reference points. I propose a fundamental reworking of this section of the platform.

The general premise concerning the priority nature of values common to all mankind and their affirmation is clear. But I believe we cannot today renounce the molding of a class philosophy, historical consciousness and patriotism, which under current conditions is unacceptable outside of internationalism.

Fourth, we are all today concerned about the moral and professional-ethical corruption of a part of society. Nor has it bypassed the party sphere, including communists on a high rung of the social and party ladder. This is why I consider it premature to abandon such concepts as communist and socialist morality, party ethics and moral culture. Nor, unfortunately, does the draft contain such ethical categories as duty, honor, conscience and moral responsibility. Is it appropriate in our times not to pointedly raise the problems of the moral cleansing of the party, and of all of society too?

And, finally, it would be expedient, in my view, if the propositions of the platform on military reform expressed more clearly the CPSU's position on the need for the accelerated elaboration of the prospects for the development of the Soviet Armed Forces and the party-political authorities in the Army and Navy.

With regard to the negative opinion of military service that is taking shape in society, particularly in certain union republics, not without the endeavors of a number of press organs, it is extremely important to clarify the functions of the Army and Navy and their role in the interests of state security. Without a fundamental elaboration of these issues, the process of the accomplishment of military reform and the entire set of problems of defensive organizational development cannot, I believe, be successful.

Baltic Republics

Mazowiecki Agrees To Mediate for Lithuania

LD2803103190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] The Sajudis Information Agency reports: Polish Premier Mazowiecki has agreed to mediate negotiations between Lithuania and the Soviet Union. This has been announced by the chairman of the World Lithuanian Community, Vytautas Bieliauskas.

Landsbergis Calls for Law on Military Service

LD2803085590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0723 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Statement by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, at the Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Text] I would like to ask a question and at the same time I would like to urge completion of a particular law, so that it is prepared quickly, and this is the law on the alternative military service. The issue was being prepared earlier.

This is because in the nearest future we will be confronted with the problem of illegal recruitment to the Soviet Armed Forces.

Therefore, perhaps certain conflicts could be avoided if we have this law—first of all, legal and constitutional clashes—because the other side would be compelled to demand that we obey laws which are not valid in Lithuania. However, Lithuania has the power to obey its own laws. If we have a law on alternative military service, perhaps this problem will not look so acute.

Volunteer Militias To Protect Public Buildings

LD2803101690 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 27 Mar 90

["News About Lithuania" presented by Rima Jakutyte]

[Text] Because of possible provocations and actions by certain public groups, a decree was adopted by the Council of Ministers of Lithuania by which mandates of volunteer militia men valid for two days were granted to 110 men. They have been entrusted with the task of public protection of the house of the Supreme Soviet, radio and television buildings, and post and telegraph buildings.

Lithuanian Deputy Protests Party School Intrusion

LD2803091190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0730 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Statement by Deputy Saulius Razma at the Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live relay]

[Excerpts] As you know, the republic's government, supporting the initiative of the Lithuanian Communist Party has handed over the Higher Party School, its buildings, and the entire property to the Teachers' Training Institute, because the material base of that institute is extremely poor. [passage omitted]

On 25 March, at 1800, soldiers invaded the Higher Party School crudely violating the rights of the high school autonomy. They occupied the building and started disturbing the process of teaching although lectures were taking place in the Higher Party School. Our historians are learning there, the Institute for Raising Qualifications of Teachers of the Russian Language has been moved there too. Normal studies have been taking place there, but all this was crudely interrupted by those soldiers. It seems that this was the first such case in the history of the Lithuanian high school after, the fascists on 17 March 1943 desecrated and closed down Vilnius University.

Yesterday, the Higher Party School was completely blockaded by soldiers. They did not even allow anyone to enter the building and studies were cancelled. Therefore, the scientific councils of our two high schools—the Teachers' Training Institute and the Higher Party School—strongly protest and ask the Supreme Council to join this protest and appeal to the UNESCO organization.

The students of the Teachers' Training Institute, since they could not attend their lectures, have organized several concerts at the Higher Party School, because they have nothing else to do but to dance. They have collected R754, 76 copecks. On behalf of the students I am instructed to hand this money to the republic's minister of health, Oleka, for the restoration of the Nujoji Vilnia hospial. [passage omitted] [applause]

Lithuanian Red Cross Protests Hospital Stormings

LD2803103590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Report from Sajudis Information Agency]

[Text] Vilnius. The Presidium of the Lithuanian Republic's Red Cross, noting crude violations of international human rights and of the rights of the Red Cross during the attack on the Naujoji Vilnia and Ztegzdriai, [hospitals] makes a strong protest to the Soviet Union's Government and demands that these acts by the military be stopped. It repeatedly appeals to the International Red Cross asking for help and for them to send international experts to the republic of Lithuania.

Lithuanian Minister Blames Ryzhkov for Problems

AU2803094690 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 28 Mar 90 p 2

[Marianne Sajdik dispatch from Vilnius: "A Common Baltic Market"]

[Text] After the election of the new Lithuanian minister of culture, non-party Sajudis member Darius Koulys

(29), with 92 yes votes and no votes against him; and Romualdas Ozoals, deputy chairman of the Sajudis Sejm, held an impromptu news conference on Monday [26 March], at which he noted that, as a result of the talks of Supreme Soviet Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis with high Soviet generals, tensions have eased.

On Tuesday morning, when I attempted to enter the building of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania (CPL) for an interview with Lithuanian Social Affairs Minister Algis Dobrovolskas, I face closed doors. Enraged crowds block the building and state that it has been occupied by the "Stalinists."

Through the tinted glass of the entrance one can see about 10 heavily armed soldiers of a special airborne troop unit. The soldiers, who are mainly young men, are nervously standing guard inside the building. Excessively enraged Lithuanians who are angrily hammering against the door and making faces at them through the glass in order to provoke the soldiers are asked for moderation by level-headed fellow citizens. Finally my interlocutor appears and I am pulled into the building by the soldiers. The corridors of the Central Committee building are completely empty, the party functionaries have holed up in their offices. In total, about 50 soldiers reportedly control the building. Behind closed doors negotiations are going on about the distribution of the floors between the CPL that is loyal to Moscow with its chairman Shvadas and the split-off CPL with chairman Algirdas Brazauskas.

In the office of Social Affairs Minister Algis Dobrovolskas, a Central Committee member of Brazauskas' party, the atmosphere is tense. The sudden appearance of the soldiers was a surprise for everyone, but one must not dramatize the situation, he says. The establishment of an independent republic of Lithuania was a purely political step, taken perhaps not quite at the right time. Economically, the country has in no way been prepared for this step.

First and foremost, Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov, who has always delayed the long overdue preparatory legal measures for greater economic independence of the republics of the union is to blame for this. Therefore, steps are being taken now toward the establishment of a common Baltic market with the inclusion of Estonia and Latvia. There are good prospects for this; the important thing is that the people are doing their work calmly and do not go on strike. He, Dobrovolskas, is for a referendum about Lithuania's secession from the Soviet Union; at the same time, he notes that about 80 percent of the Lithuanian population, regardless of their nationality, are in favor of independence. At a free popular election Landsbergis would not have become president of parliament, but Brazauskas would have received a clear majority from the people, who think that he has greater political sensitivity.

Eviction of Communists in Lithuania Noted

PM2803102190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Mar 90 Second Edition p 8

[Dispatch by "our special correspondent" S. Shevtsov: "Eviction"]

[Text] The members of Sajudis are trying to persuade the public that there is no cause to be perturbed by the situation in Lithuania: "Sajudis" does not want confrontation. And perhaps it is indeed interested in consensus, but through the complete and unconditional capitulation of all socialist and internationalist forces in the republic and the renunciation of their convictions by hundreds of thousands of people. Consequently, with "Sajudis'" democracy and pluralism there should be no two opinions. That is why a total offensive is being waged against those who try to express their disagreement with the policy of the present Lithuanian leadership.

Yesterday in the square outside the Lithuanian Communist Party (reorganized) Central Committee building I had the opportunity to observe one of those who is "devoted to 'Sajudis' heart and soul." A rosy-cheeked, fashionably dressed youth of 17 or 18 named Linas surrounded by several girls of the same age was shouting filthy insults at the people who had come here with posters and slogans reading "Lithuania without the USSR is Lithuania without a future" and "no to the endowment of other parties at the expense of CPSU property." I asked Linas why he was so excited.

"Why are these people here?!" he shouted so loudly that foreign journalists with movie cameras began to gather round us. "Surely they are not indigenous inhabitants of Lithuania?"

He approached an elderly woman and bent toward her:

"Why are you protesting here, you are on foreign soil, you are aliens here! You would do better to get a shovel and collect the garbage."

Here Linas was rewarded with an approval giggle from his friends.

Yet a minute later in the same square I was talking with Yelizaveta Fedorovna Rodionova. There were pain and despair in her eyes.

"That is how we are living," she told me. "Our youth passed in the war, in hunger and cold. Now I am a pensioner and I should like to live peacefully and raise my grandchildren. But there is no peace. You heard him say we are aliens here? I am a former construction worker, that Communist Party Central Committee building, that house next to it, the houses on Lenin Square—I constructed all that with other people, stone by stone. We raised Vilnius. We worked on Sundays. We drove out to the state farms and collective farms and brought in the harvest. How much effort has been invested here—a whole life. And now we are aliens,

'occupiers?'" Yelizaveta Fedorovna shakes her head. "We have to go. But where? My father and mother are buried here."

A tall elderly man—Yevgeniush Andriyevskiy—joins in the conversation.

"I liberated Lithuania from the German fascists and I have combat orders," he says. "Previously, like all veterans, I enjoyed privileges. But I went into the store and got the reply: 'As of 31 March all privileges for veterans are repealed.' That is the decision of the city authorities. We will have to pay now to travel on public transport. If that were all," the veteran waved his hand, "we would survive. But it has gotten to the point where my schoolboy grandsons are insulted on the trolleybus merely because they speak Russian! My neighbor in the apartment block recently completely dumbfounded me. He saw me painting my garage and flung at me so maliciously: 'Paint away, the garage will soon belong to me when you all get out of here.'"

The conflict over the further ownership of the property of the Lithuanian party Central Committee met with quite a broad response in the republic. The most implausible rumors are circulating on this score. I came to the Vilnius Party Gorkom [city committee] for explanations.

"It would seem that there should have been no disputes," Ilya Mironovich Butrimovich, first secretary of the Sovetskiy Raykom [rayon committee] says. "A CPSU Central Committee commission arrived. A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Central Committee of the revised party, and his second secretary, V. Berezov, promised to share out the property fairly. But the aircraft carrying the commission members had scarcely had time to take off for Moscow before we were told: We shall not share it."

Students from the teacher's training college began to move into the Vilnius Higher Party School which belongs to the CPSU Central Committee, he continued. "The Higher Party School rector—a Sajudis member—had agreed with someone behind our backs to hand over the building to an outside organization. Or another example: Until recently the party gorkom building in which we are now, housed communists standing on different platforms. And one night recently some people furtively began to fit new locks in all the offices. And in the morning they moved in cooperative members and representatives of the national minorities committee and the social democratic party.. Of course, there was no room left for us. That is why the workers voluntary militia have been obliged to put the building under guard. We again appealed to representatives of A. Brazauskas' party to hold talks and divide the property honestly. But again we received a refusal. We are simply being hounded out by force."

In Kaunas, Alitus, and Klaypeda the communists who have remained on the CPSU platform have been evicted from their premises with the aid of the militia. The Sajudis members are evicting veterans' councils and party committees from their premises. At production facilities representatives of the administration are informing party committee secretaries: "These rooms will be used for other needs." In Vilnius' Leninskiy Rayon there are two large party committees at the housing services uniting communists, mainly pensioners, at their place of residence. Yu. Tsibulskikh, deputy chairman of the Leninskiy Rayon Soviet Executive Committee, has given instructions for these party committees to be evicted. And now the communists have been obliged to hold meetings in private apartments.

At the party gorkom I learned that threats have become more frequent against communists who have remained on the CPSU platform. Gorkom worker Anatoliy Petrovich Lanin described emotionally how he had returned an hour ago from home, where he had been urgently called by his 13-year-old daughter Beata. The father found the little girl frightened and in tears. Some man had telephoned her and warned her in broken Russian: "Polya Lanina (he had taken Anatoliy Petrovich's daughter for his wife), people will come today and destroy your apartment."

Much has already been written and said about how the Soviet Army and the internal and border troops are being defamed in the republic. Tension is also growing in the servicemen's families. I was given examples of the wives of servicemen being called the wives of occupiers and of various artificial inconveniences and difficulties being created for them at their work places.

It was already evening when in the 10th issue of "Sajudis'" Russian language newspaper SOGLASIYE I read: "In addition to 5 million servicemen, the Soviet Army feeds a further 7 million pigs, 10,000 cows, and 0.25 million sheep. First they are fattened and then they are sent for slaughter." Those are the parallels and calculations which are being made.

Lithuanian Official on 'Mass Exodus' of Russians

LD2703114390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0933 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 17 Mar (TASS)—One thousand eight hundred people in the Lithuanian town of Siauliai have already expressed their desire to leave Lithuania immediately. The list grows longer every day. There is just one motive: the unstable political and economic situation in Lithuania. "I fear that we are about to see a mass exodus by the Russian-speaking population," P. Sotnikov, second secretary of Siauliai Party (CPSU Platform) city party committee told a GUDOK correspondent. For example, just since 1988, 50 specialists have left the Siauliai section of the railway.

One can hardly talk about any measures to stabilize the situation in Lithuania, in the view of P. Sotnikov. Rather the opposite is true. A law on banning organizations of a so-called "foreign" state is being prepared.

"Sajudis" has started recruiting people to its units for the defense of the Lithuanian border. Since the election of deputies to the local soviets, its aim has been to put its supporters into government bodies. "And I think they are succeeding."

"Sajudis" is using dozens of mass media organs, including television and radio, to dupe the people, continued Sotnikov. Naturally, the people are forming a biased opinion. People here say that the Russians are fleecing the Lithuanians, that Lithuanians provide meat for the whole Soviet Union and that the republic has better power generating possibilities than the USSR. In other words, the opinion that Lithuania can easily survive outside the Soviet Union is being created. It is hard to say whether delusion or naivety is more in evidence. Despite this demagogy, there are more and more sober-minded people who have grave doubts about whether a republic which has no reliable economic levers and no raw material base can resolve its problems independently.

Lithuania Situation Remains 'Complex, Tense'

LD2803114990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 28 Mar 90

[TASS correspondent report]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Mar (TASS)—The situation in Lithuania remains complex and tense. The propaganda campaign waged by the Lithuanian authorities to discredit the Soviet Army is continuing. The separatist forces, resorting to blackmail and intimidation, incite servicemen to desert from the ranks of the Armed Forces.

The bodies of the republican MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] refuse to take measures to detain them and to return them to military units. Procuracy bodies also remain inactive. Moreover, the government of the republic has appealed to the International Red Cross to take under its protection the Lithuanians who have refused to serve in the Soviet Army. Deserters are being given passports, they are being given residence permits where they live without being registered at the military commissariats. This, however, is no impediment to have them enlisted in the so-called "detachments for the defense of the country" now being formed in Lithuania. For example, a detachment of this kind in the town of Klaypeda already numbers some 300 people. Its members are being supplied with field uniforms.

According to a report in today's "KRASNAYA ZVEZDA" Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, has stated that allegedly a "bloody terror" has started in the republic. In making this statement, he used distorted information about the actions of the Armed Forces in capturing deserters in the republican hospital building. At the same time, notes KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, the doctor on duty at the hospital has confirmed that a group of landing troops came up into the department where the deserters were. They were lined up in the corridor and then taken off to a vehicle. No violence was used against them while this was happening. According to P. Navashinkas, deputy chief doctor at the hospital, on instructions from the republic's health minister, the wards in this department had been put at the disposal of servicemen who had deserted their units. None of them were ill. They were registered as patients but were not undergoing any treatment.

According to Colonel Yu Nauman, a representative of the USSR Ministry of Defense, the Supreme Soviet in the person of Vytautas Landsbergis and also the Lithuanian government have recently been calling openly upon the young men of Lithuania who have already left their units not to return to their barracks. Deserters are being hidden in churches, hospitals, and state institutions. All attempts by representatives of the Army to resolve problems through dialogue with the Lithuanian government have proved to be in vain. Meanwhile, the decisions of the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the decisions of the USSR Government, and the decree of the USSR president remain in force. And nobody should be in any doubt that law and order will be restored on Lithuanian territory. All those who have left their military units and who are hiding in churches and other places will sooner or later be returned to their barracks. Their fate will be decided in accordance with Soviet laws, stressd the representative of the USSR Ministry of Defense.

Sensible forces in the republic are receiving with understanding the forced measures adopted by military units in fulfilment of the USSR president's decree. A many thousand strong protest meeting was held in Vilnius on Tuesday against the unconstitutional decisions of the government of Lithuania. The leitmotiv of the addresses at the meeting was the thought that such important matters as the republic's self-determination can only be addressed by way of a nationwide referendum.

The meeting was preceded by a campaign of pressure from the current leaders of the republic. In the mass media they have emphasized in every way the thought that the meeting was not sanctioned by the authorities, and that those taking part would be registered by representatives of the special services (clearly, the new, local special services) with a view to subsequent punishment. As the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reports today, in Kaunas, Alytus and Klaipeda communists who have remained on the CPSU platform have been evicted from their premises with the help of the militia. Threats towards them have grown in number. Members of Sajudis are evicting veterans' councils and party committees from their premises.

The TRUD newspaper today opposes attempts by the Lithuanian authorities to grant themselves the right to take charge of the Ignalia Atomic Power Station. There are, the newspaper writes, strict rules for the safe use of atomic power stations. They are implemented under

strict monitoring by union-wide services and departments, above all the USSR Gospromatomnadzor [State Committee for the Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Nuclear Power Industry]. "Independence" and local initiative are out of the question here.

"The Lithuanian people have the right of secession of their republic from the USSR and the posing of the question thus is legitimate," USSR People's Deputy Konstantin Lubenchenko said in an interview for the newspaper RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. "But the section of the population which is not Lithuanian, the representatives of other nationalities must not be forgotten. In all cases where one is dealing with the secession of one territory from another and with the acquisition of indpendent status, in whatever form it may take place, it is always important to ensure that this transfer is implemented in such a way that the interests of the sides are observed."

Paper Asserts Tension 'Fueled' by Sajudis

PM2703133190 Moscow TRUD in Russian
27 Mar 90 p 1

[Special correspondent A. Petrov article: "Those Who Are Fueling the Situation"]

[Text] Life in Vilnius is tense and outwardly anxious—something to which the city's people have already become accustomed. The newspapers are full of reports from the republic's Supreme Soviet: on the reorganization of the Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, the adoption of a Law on the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, and the appointment of a new prosecutor, even though the latter is the USSR Prosecutor General's prerogative. The radio carries debates on Moscow's latest response: Should there be an expression of protest and regret at its actions? Just a protest? Or just regret?...

The anxiety can be seen on people's faces: What will tomorrow bring? You cannot call the past weeks calm. I recall how at a rally 18 March a representative of the military command reported that 200 servicemen from Lithuania had broken their oath and deserted from their units. A few days later V. Landsbergis, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, admitted that the number had already reached 300...

On 21 March, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's decree was published envisaging, among other measures to safeguard the rights of Soviet citizens in Lithuania, the surrender of firearms. A little over 80 guns have now been surrendered in Vilnius. But thousands of people had weapons... A week ago the registration of volunteers for the protection of the borders of "autonomous" [samostoyatelnyy] Lithuania began. I wanted precise details, so I phoned the number on the Sajudis leaflet calling volunteers to arms. "The figure is secret," I was told...

I could cite many other alarming facts from life in Lithuania today. The situation is not encouraging. And it is being fueled not by Moscow, as some parliamentarians try to persuade the republic's inhabitants, but by members of Sajudis, who form the majority in the Supreme Soviet. Although by no means the bulk of the electorate voted for them. As the independent newspaper RESPUBLIKA writes, they do not have the moral right to dictate their will to Lithuania's inhabitants. But they are doing so and increasingly peremptorily day by day. They adopted an emergency decision on withdrawing from the USSR and then swamped people with dozens of laws, statements, and appeals addressed to all and sundry. The impression you get is that, the more the atmosphere is inflamed, the more V. Landsbergis and his associates like it: After all, it is not easy for the public to properly assess their furious activity and its possible consequences in such a tense atmosphere.

Thousands of TV viewers saw how the chairman of the republic's DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] committee explained his order to people to surrender their weapons for safekeeping. But did many of them consider this question at that time: Do parliamentarians themselves not have an interest in seeing that weapons are not seized and used by irresponsible people? But when Z. Vayshvila, chairman of a Supreme Soviet standing commission, stated after the USSR president's decree that the population need not surrender hunting rifles, Vayshvila (either through callowness or some other reason) was not lacking in ill-considered statements and suggestions. In parliament, however, there are quite a few wise old heads... They must know that a parliamentarian should not urge his citizens to violate a decree from the president of the country, when secession has not yet been recognized by the sides involved.

Certain parliamentarians are not averse to the following "ploys" either. R. Valatka, a deputy of the republic's Supreme Soviet, said on television 22 March that in the words of "one MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] officer," some burly, Lithuanian-speaking men had come from Moscow to join the republic's KGB. Shrewd TV viewers were clearly supposed to take that information in the following way: Those burly men were sent to organize disorders so that the responsibility for them could be pinned on the Lithuanian people. The television studio received a protest from the KGB. Valatka read out the text of it and sighed with relief: Thank God, he said, one problem less in Lithuania. There were no "burly men from Moscow," it turns out, and there aren't any now. But did television viewers then begin thinking: Why is Valatka inflaming passions "with the help" of this mysterious "MVD officer"?

Everyone living in Lithuania has much to think about these days. And should recall the events of the recent past. For example, of September 1989 when the committee for the defense of Soviet power in the republic was created. At that time I heard numerous accusations

against it at rallies and meetings. The republic's newspapers vented so much irony and sarcasm on that committee! No one has any intention of attacking Soviet power, they said, these are just the intrigues of "Moscow stooges" and attempts to artificially inflame the situation. And this month the republic was stunned by the resurrection of the bourgeois Constitution of 1938, which makes no mention of Soviet power. Or of the benefits prescribed by that power for war and labor disabled, single mothers, and low-income families. And now those people who have been duped are sending telegrams to Moscow saying: "We, women of different nationalities, protest against the decision on the republic's secession from the USSR. We were raised and grew up here. Our fathers died here for the liberation of Lithuania..." And those who tried to pacify public opinion last September are now sitting in parliament or dashing off articles for the local newspapers, trying to force more and more new ideas into people's heads.

Another event has taken place in Lithuania's political life. Yesterday the latest issue of SOVETSKAYA LITVA appeared: Its publication had been halted by decision of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium. It has been replaced by EKHO LITVY with no consideration for subscribers' opinions. SOVETSKAYA LITVA, which was the organ of the Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers, has become the newspaper of the Lithuanian Communist Party. The editorial office considered the words "on the CPSU platform" superfluous for the following reason: It is the so-called independent but essentially reorganized party, which has renounced Marxism-Leninism, that needs additions and clarifications... The republic Communist Party newspaper considers its paramount task to be the defense of working people's interests.

This is necessary now because there have been many examples of hypocrisy and exploitation of people's natural national feelings recently. So much talk of justice, equality and freedom, and pluralism has been heard not just at sessions of the Sajudis Seimas but at the Central Committee of the then united Communist Party of Lithuania! And now all these words are being used by the leaders of the party which has split from the CPSU... And the other day that committee's building was virtually handed over to outside organizations with the blessing of a plenum of the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party's Vilnius city committee [gorkom]. Explaining this decision, A. Gricius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party gorkom, earned himself prestige by arguing for justice in the pages of the local press. Although for justice's sake he should also have mentioned the equal rights to the gorkom building of members of the CPSU, whose party committees now have nothing left of the common property belonging to the once-united republic Communist Party and who take refuge wherever they can.

Yes, you don't build up sound capital by ambiguous "dealings." Just as, clearly, you cannot endlessly make capital from accounts of the Stalin era repressions and past mistakes.

Lithuania's inhabitants have the right to decide their destiny themselves. Only they can say whether the republic should exist inside or outside the USSR. And if Lithuania is fated to break away, that should be after consideration of the interests of all the peoples living on its soil and the interests of the republics bound together by thousands of links. That, surely, is the only way which corresponds to the principles of justice, not just in words but in deeds, too.

Landsbergis Interviewed on Conflict With Moscow

AU2603173490 Hamburg BILD in German 26 Mar 90 p 2

[Interview with Vytautas Landsbergis by Karl-Ludwig Guensche; place and date not given: "We Will Sacrifice Ourselves to Freedom"]

[Text] The Lithuanians are determined to defend their independence against Gorbachev with all the means at their disposal. We will sacrifice ourselves for freedom, Lithuanian President Landsbergis insisted in a long, courageous interview with BILD. Yesterday his country was supported by the pope. John Paul II called on Moscow and Vilnius to find a peaceful solution. The night before Gorbachev had 100 tanks roll through Vilnius as a demonstration of power. In addition, Moscow has strengthened the troops along the Lithuanian border.

[Wuensche] Will the Lithuanians fight for their freedom?

[Landsbergis] Our people have always fought for their freedom when they were deprived of it by force. Hundreds of thousands of us have died for freedom. Also during the time of bondage we preserved our culture and our identity. This has now led to the rebirth of our nation. Now it is not a question of fighting with guns, now we have to use our political and moral power—even if our opponent tries to act against us with guns.

[Wuensche] How big is the danger of a violent conflict?

[Landsbergis] I think that our opponent is currently using his military power rather to provoke us. But we will not permit ourselves to be provoked.

[Wuensche] Are there provocations?

[Landsbergis] Yes, unfortunately. I met with the Soviet officers who are stationed here and asked them not to incite my fellow-citizens to violence. However, unfortunately, they are doing nevertheless. They let tanks roll, and they arrest young Lithuanians who no longer want to serve in the Soviet Army. At the moment, they are waging a psychological war against us.

[Wuensche] Will it be possible to avoid the use of force in this case?

[Landsbergis] If our opponent relies on guns instead of arguments, in our country there will certainly be people, young ones in particular, who will sacrifice themselves for freedom, because our people still feel the pain about the fact that in 1940 we did not go underground to fight against annexation to the Soviet Union. Therefore, I am very worried that, this time, there will be fighting in individual areas. But I appeal to my fellow-citizens: Do not shoot at tanks with hunting guns. Do not permit yourselves to be provoked to violence.

[Wuensche] What is going to happen now?

[Landsbergis] There will be a solution—but no one knows how much it will cost us. It may well be that we will be destroyed. But then the whole Soviet Union will explode. However, if—and I hope this will happen—all the world supports us, we will be able to resolve the problem peacefully.

Reportage on 27 Mar Vilnius Pro-Moscow Rally

No Incidents Reported

LD2803101890 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] A rally organized by the Committee for Protection of the Citizens of the USSR took place outside the building of the Lithuanian Supreme Council today. Juozas Kavolis reports:

[Begin Kavolis recording] Actions which the Soviet Armed Forces carried out last night and in the early hours of this morning caused public concern and gave rise to all sorts of rumors which reached their peak in Vilnius about midday. The main concern was about the possible outcome of the meeting outside the building of the Supreme Council which was prepared by forces directed against the independence of Lithuania. These organizations were supported by military helicopters which have been dropping leaflets on the city for two days.

In an attempt to avoid possible provocations or even forced entry of the parliament building, barriers were erected and more than 200 militiamen were brought in. It was announced in advance that the militiamen would be unarmed. For the sake of safety, Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis even suggested that all woman should leave the premises of the parliament for the time being.

Meanwhile, the rally finished without incident. It can harly be possible that its organizers were pleased with the level of attendance. About 7,000 protesters took part in the rally.

Hatred toward the Supreme Council of Lithuania and its decisions resounded through green army loudspeakers for an hour, although after the USSR national anthem, the tune of the national anthem of Lithuania was also played. Several tricolors could be seen among the red hammer and sickle flags. The speakers, all of them speaking in Russian, urged that the powers of the USSR president be used in Lithuania, that daily protests be held in enterprises, and that the force which Sajudis nationalists could allegedly use against citizens of the USSR should be met with force.

Lithuania has become used to rallies of this kind; it is also easy to recognize the style of the organizers. Some time ago, the so-called internationalists used to protest against the proclamation of the Lithuanian language as a state language. Following this, on many occasions it was claimed that the Lithuanian Communist Party was being saved. Today they mounted yet another hobby-horse: Lithuania perhaps could decide its future itself, the speakers at the rally said, but only through a referendum. This was probably the word used most frequently at the rally, as if it were the main means for saving socialism in Lithuania.

However, ridicule of members of the present Lithuanian government was greatly welcomed by the crowd. When Vytautas Landsbergis, Kazimiera Prunskiene, Algirdas Brazauskas, or Romualdas Ozolas was mentioned in one way or another, one could easily read in the faces of the protesters: Socialist Lithuania has almost been saved. [end recording]

More on Vilnius Rally

LD2703200290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The situation in Lithuania continues to remain complicated. Every day in our program we broadcast reports by our special correspondents from the republic. Here is the material that we have just received

[Begin recording] [Correspondent P. Orlov] Today at its session the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania supported the decision of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the prime minister of the government of Lithuania to send a note to the government of the USSR, in connection with the situation that has taken shape in the republic.

At the same time in the square next to the Supreme Soviet citizens thronged. The inhabitants of Lithuania who gathered at this rally—the organizers estimate the number of them to be approximately 20,000—expressed their disagreement with the policy presently being conducted by the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania. They call for a single presidential rule, in order to ensure freedom of speech, freedom of civil rights for all the inhabitants of Lithuania.

[V.N. Khadunkin, secretary of Vilnius City Party Committee for the CPSU platform] In a situation like the one that has taken shape in the republic when the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania has abolished the effect of the USSR Constitution on the territory of the republic and of

USSR legislation, we have turned out to be citizens of the USSR who are not under the legal umbrella figuratively speaking. And today from the point of view of the law nothing protects us, since the deputies of the Supreme Soviet, as you see, are taking up positions of confrontation with the Union, with its Constitution, and its legislation. Therefore, here we can regard presidential rule as some kind of unique compensation for that constitutional and legal vacuum for the citizens of the USSR, to preserve law and order and union interests.

[Orlov] In conclusion at the meeting its participants demanded that activity aimed at confrontation with the central authorities should be ceased in the republic. They spoke out against the law that is being drafted on the criminal prosecution of people who speak out in favor of Lithuania being part of the Union with the USSR. [end recording] [video shows scenes at the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, crowds gathering in the square in front of the building, interview with party secretary and people standing on the rooftops]

TASS on Rally

LD2703203390 Moscow TASS in English 2001 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—Many thousands of working people and representatives of the intelligentsia of the Lithuanian capital held a rally outside the building of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet in Vilnius today. [Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 27 March reports that organizers of the rally "estimated the number of them to be approximately 20,000."]

The rally was prompted by the concern over unconstitutional decisions of the Lithuanian government. Speeches at the rally were keynoted by the thought that such important matters as the republic's self-determination can only be decided by a nation- wide referendum.

The rally passed in a peaceful way, without any excesses.

The current leaders of the republic put up pressure before the rally. They emphasised in the media that the rally had not been sanctioned by the authorities. They said that participants in the rally will be identified by representatives of special services to be punished.

Sober-minded forces in the republic show understanding for the enforced measures taken by Army units to fulfill the decree of the Soviet president on the protection of important state facilities.

What is the attitude of residents of border areas to the tightening of the USSR state borders on the Lithuanian territory?

"The attitude of Lithuanians residing in border areas to soldiers has not changed," Colonel A. Zablovski, representative of the Main Command of Frontier Troops, told TASS; "Voluntary public order squads continue to assist frontier guards. We hear workers and collective farmers say that Lithuanian, Russian and other peoples living in the republic have nothing to quarrel over, that they have the same country. The same is said by Lithuanian frontier guards. And Lithuanians are among those who man every frontier post in the Lithuanian territory."

The situation in Lithuania is actively influenced by communists, who after the split of the Lithuanian Communist Party, continue to adhere to the platform of the Soviet Communist Party. The first issue of the newspaper SOVIET LITHUANIA was published on their intitiative in Vilnius. The newspaper will be published in Lithuanian, Russian and Polish.

The plenum of the Central Committee of the independent Communist Party was held on Monday. First Secretary of the Central Committee Algirdas Brazauskas delivered a report. He said the political situation in Lithuania was complex and tried to assess the prospects for the party's activity.

It was proposed at the plenum to convene a congress of the Communist Party in the current year and to rename it. These proposals have not been endorsed by members of the Central Committee.

The plenum endorsed the act of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet "on the restoration of independent Lithuanian state."

Lithuanian Situation Reviewed by Soviet Press

LD2703155990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1305 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Unidentified TASS correspondent report: "The Situation in Lithuania—Summary of Events for the Morning"]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS)—The situation in Lithuanian remains complex. The regiment of assault troops that entered the capital of this Baltic republic a few days ago is carrying out the instructions of the president and Government of the USSR on strengthening the protection of important state installations, including industrial and defense enterprises and buildings. Army General Valentin Varennikov, commander of the Land Troops of the USSR Armed Forces, stressed in an interview published in the newspaper PRAVDA today that the matter of guarding state installations cannot be entrusted to the current minister of internal affairs of Lithuania, who has plainly stated that he will not implement Soviet laws.

The local press has today published a decision of the Supreme Council of Lithuania that states that "the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Lithuanian Republic, its subunits and services, are subordinate only to the government of the Lithuanian Republic and implement only the laws of the Lithuanian Republic and the decisions of its government." [passage omitted]

The chairman of the Supreme Council of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis, admitted in a conversation today

with journalists that on Monday evening the representatives of the military command handed to him a three-page list of illegal acts committed recently on the territory of the republic, including several attacks on military installations and Communist Party buildings.

Representatives of public organizations of neigboring Baltic republics are also helping to whip up nationalist euphoria in the political life of Lithuania. Today the local press published a statement by the Baltic Council that says, specifically, that the Council, "on behalf of the people's movements of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, appeals to all public movements and democratic parties to support in every possible way the efforts of the peoples of the Baltic to achieve the restoration of full state independence by a peaceful parliamentary path."

In the view of observers covering the situation in Lithuania in the Soviet press, the unstable political and economic situation there could lead to the mass departure of the Russian-speaking population from the republic. Already, 1,800 people in the Lithuanian city of Siauliai have expressed the wish to leave Lithuania immediately. This list is growing day by day, the GUDOK paper reports in particular.

Communists who remained on the CPSU platform after the CPL [Communist Party of Lithuania] split are actively influencing the situation in the republic. In Vilnius, for example, the first edition of the paper SOVETSKAYA LITYA has come out on their initiative. It is planned to bring out the paper, which is so far being printed outside the republic as a result of counteraction by the current Lithuanian authorities, in Lithuanian, Russian, and Polish. This paper is necessary not only for communists who have remained true to internationalism, but it is needed by the hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people who do not wish to follow a bourgeois, nationalist government and do not wish the republic to break away from the Soviet Union, Stanislava Joniene, editor-in-chief of SOVETSKAYA LITVA, said in a conversation with journalists.

General on Lithuanian Campaign Against Military

LD2803132790 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 28 Mar 90

[by TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow March 28 TASS—"A propaganda campaign to discredit the Army and the Navy is gaining momentum in Lithuania", Soviet Airborne Commander Colonel-General Vladislav Achalov told TASS upon his return from Lithuania.

Achalov noted that provocations against servicemen and incidents of young hooligans attacking specific soldiers and military facilities are becoming more frequent in the republic.

A group of civilians recently infiltrated an Army unit in Kaunas and, threatening an orderly with a gun, tried to break down the door of a room storing weapons, the general said.

He also noted that a few hooligans threw stones at sentries guarding an Air Force warehouse in Kaunas. "A similar attack by unidentified individuals on car park sentry Alimzhan Almakov was reported from Kaunas," Achalov stressed. The soldier was injured in the attack.

There have been many such cases, Achalov said.

He believes that the attackers aimed to seize arms and provoke servicemen into opening fire. But the latter showed restraint and did not yield to provocations, although sentries are able to use arms for self-protection in accordance with the service regulations.

"One can imagine the anti-Soviet racket 'Sajudis' representatives would raise, if this had actually happened", the commander said.

Sharply denouncing these provocations against the Armed Forces, the general said that they are organised in the interests of not the Lithuanian people but political adventurers, who are dreaming to destabilise the situation in Lithuania and tear the republic away from the USSR.

Lithuania Said Attempting To Discredit Army

LD2703181790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS)—A propaganda campaign to discredit the Soviet Army is a component part of the unlawful and anticonstitutional activities of the Lithuanian government, directed toward the republic's secession from the USSR.

It was reported in the USSR Defense Ministry press center today that separatist forces, resorting to blackmail and intimidation, are provoking servicemen to desert from the ranks of the Armed Forces. With this aim, their emissaries are attempting to penetrate military units and are taking other provocative actions. The Commission on Matters of the Military Service of Young Men attached to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet is continuing its instigations.

The republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs bodies are refusing to take steps to detain and return them to their military units. The procuracy bodies are also continuing to be inactive. Moreover, the republic's government has made an appeal to the International Red Cross to take Lithuanians refusing to serve in the Soviet Army under its protection.

Incidents concerning the concealment of deserters in psychiatric hospitals are also known. Deserters are being issued passports and are being registered at their place of residence without registering at military commissariats. However, this does not prevent them from being

included in the so-called "Detachments for the Defense of the Kray" that are now being formed in Lithuania. For example, such a detachment in the town of Klaipeda, according to the data available, already numbers about 300 people. Its members are being provided with field uniforms.

Measures are being taken, it is noted in the Defense Ministry press center report, by the commanders and the bodies of military justice to stop desertion and return all those who have left their units to their place of service.

The press center report says that an unworthy propaganda campaign is being waged in Lithuania, the purpose of which is to distort the historic truth regarding Lithuania's entry into membership in the USSR, as well as the falsification of the results of World War II.

Thus, on 23 March a 76-mm cannon, that had been removed from the base of the monument to the Soviet servicemen who liberated the republic from the fascists, was delivered to the building of the rayon military registration and enlistment office in the town of Vilkaviskis. At a rally a representative of the nationalistic organisation "Sajudis" frightened those gathered with the imaginary "brutalities" committed by servicemen when confiscating weapons. He stated that these "pieces of information" will be brought to the notice of the U.S. Congress.

The whipping up of emotions by representatives of the nationalist organization "Sajudis" [words indistinct]. (?Reports) in the Western mass media on the beating up of arrested deserters or any atrocities are groundless and only serve instigation purposes, the Defense Ministry press center report says.

Yazov Denies 'Armed Actions' in Lithuania

LD2703191790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] After his conversation with the French prime minister, USSR Defense Minister Yazov, replying to journalists' questions on the situation in Lithuania, said in particular:

[Begin Yazov recording] Well, if you want to know, so far there have been no armed actions there and there are none going on. Troops are on Lithuania's territory—the Pribaltiyskiy Military Okrug is there. The Soviet Army has not been used and I think that everything will be resolved peacefully. What hospitals? Well, evidently those who have deserted will be returned to their units. [end recording]

Lithuanian CP Official Explains Army Action

LD2703195990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by V. Dvinin and A. Kudela]

[Text] This morning subunits of assault landing forces took under their protection several buildings in Vilnius—including the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee building. Rumors began to circulate around town about military action by Moscow. Vladislav Shved, secretary of the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform, told journalists at a press conference what really happened:

[Begin recording] [Shved] CPSU property situated in the Lithuanian Republic has been taken into protection. The point is that in the 40 or so years during which the Lithuanian Communist Party has been a part of the CPSU, the CPSU's subsidies have amounted to no more and no less than R96.9 million. More than that: All the main facilities built in Lithuania over the recent period of time, the party ones, are on the CPSU's books and are, in point of fact, the property of the CPSU. When it became known to us that the party's city committee [building] was being given to the Social Democrats and the Association of Scientists and that people were already putting up nameplates and moving into the premises without prior arrangement we were compelled to take measures to protect this property.

[Unidentified reporter] Do you think that the measures that have been adopted have helped avoid a sharper confrontation of some kind?

[Shved] Our view is that using the Soviet Army for protection purposes is not the best option. We would have preferred that the Lithuanian prosecutor do this, that the laws of Lithuania do this and, in the final analysis, that the internal affairs bodies do this, as is supposed to be the case in a civilized state. However, today, as you can see, the law enforcement bodies within the republic do not consider themselves bound by the laws of the USSR. When we were ignored, misinformed for three months in a row and when the gentlemen's agreement was simply broken—forgive me, but we were left with no alternative but to resort to what I would term the last remaining body which upholds law and order. [end recording]

Defense Ministry Officials Meet With Servicemen

PM2703192190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Colonel of Justice V. Bobrenev, candidate of juridical sciences: "Meeting With Servicemen From Lithuania"]

[Text] A meeting of delegations of military construction personnel from Lithuania with leadership personnel of

the USSR Defense Ministry Main Construction Directorate and staff of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Permanent Mission in Moscow and the Main Military Prosecutor's Office has been held.

R. Verbitskas, deputy permanent representative and member of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform), gave a detailed description of the situation in the republic and shared his impressions of the meeting between USSR people's deputies from Lithuania and the USSR minister of defense.

The meeting lasted several hours. The questions from the floor were not easy. Here are just some of them. Why are servicemen not allowed to go to Lithuania? Will the Soviet Army be called upon to establish order in Lithuania? Why was a referendum not organized on the republic's secession from the USSR?

It is worth noting that no extremist or nationalist views were expressed either from the rostrum or during the exchange of opinions. Thoughtfulness and concern at the prevailing situation predominated.

Staff of the Main Military Prosecutor's Office stressed that the General Military Regulations and USSR legislation must be strictly observed by all servicemen without exception, irrespective of their nationality or place of service.

An appeal to all Lithuanian servicemen adopted on behalf of the 300 meeting participants calls for reason, decency, and honest performance of military duty to the Soviet motherland.

Views on Laws Against Loyalist Party Members

PM2703191590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 First Edition p 4

[Special correspondent Captain Third Rank V. Yermolin dispatch under "Direct Line" rubric: "Lithuania: One Step to the Left, Two Steps to the Right"]

[Text] Vilnius, 27 Mar—The headline is prompted by life itself, so to speak: On 26 March the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution "On Measures To Ensure the Normal Functioning of State and Public Enterprises, Institutions, and Organizations." The resolution notes that in recent days "calls to disobey the laws of the Lithuanian Republic and state organs' decisions" and attempts to disrupt the normal functioning of enterprises and institutions have multiplied. "These and other unlawful actions," the document states, "are being committed, among others, by the USSR Armed Forces." The prosecutor, republic minister of internal affairs, and judges are instructed "to immediately bring to book" the disturbers of the peace.

The resolution states that both the law breakers and those who incite them not to abide by the laws of the Lithuanian Republic, must be held to account. Incidentally, the circle of such people is very wide: If you follow the letter of this document, anyone who has dared, for instance, to call for the implementation of the USSR president's decree is liable for criminal punishment under the relevant article.

As for the USSR Armed Forces, they have come into conflict with the resolution because of their stubborn unwillingness to sit quietly in the republic, canceling all combat training schedules. They are being criticized more out of inertia than consciously. This is what things are like here now—evil machinations of the military are perceived in everything.

It seems that the latest verdict from the production line of the Lithuanian parliament, which is operating at breakneck speed, was adopted, like most of the preceding ones, without long deliberations and in extreme haste. But its appearance is certainly no accident. Recently V. Landsbergis spoke with unconcealed irritation from the session's rostrum about the increasing activity of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform), which is marching in the vanguard of the citizens of the republic who continue to regard themselves as being also citizens of the USSR. The spearhead of the resolution is directed above all against them. It is with them in mind that a law on criminal liability for antistate incitement is being drafted, a sort of Lithuanian version of the notorious Article 58.

It is true that the activities of the communists who have not broken with the CPSU have appreciably intensified in recent days. Publication of SOVETSKAYA LITVA, the newspaper of the republic's communists (the government newspaper EKHO LITVY is currently being published at its production base), has resumed. Work within labor collectives has been stepped up. Various kinds of acts of civil disobedience are being organized. Certain buildings that are the property of the CPSU and have been built with its funds are being taken over. All this is bound to irritate V. Landsbergis, of course, who seems to have imagined that after his advent to power total unanimity would reign in the republic. Hence the peremptory measures regarding dissidents.

Meanwhile there are facts that cannot be ignored. As "Sajudis" Secretary Andryus Kubilyus said in conversation with me, "the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform), together with the independent Communist Party and 'Sajudis' represent the main social forces in the republic, even though they differ in size." According to SOVETSKAYA LITVA, the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform) comprises some 35,000 communists in Lithuania, and 29 rayon and city committees have been set up and are in operation. It appears that Landsbergis intends to wage a political struggle against this force by means of "draconian laws."

On the other hand, the relations between the independent Communist Party and the powers that be are cloudless, judging by appearances. On Monday the "independents" held a Central Committee plenum in the Central Committee building. A. Brazauskas delivered a report on the place of the Lithuanian Communist Party

in society. He admitted, in particular, that the independent Lithuanian Communist Party practically lost the struggle for seats in local soviets. Its prestige in the republic (but is it only in the republic?) is falling catastrophically. Many people are leaving its ranks. However, a substantial section of party members are waiting for the 28th CPSU Congress before finally making up their minds. In a number of speeches at the plenum, distinct calls rang out to change the party's title to social democratic party.

During the plenum workers mounted a picket outside the Central Committee building. Their slogans eloquently expressed the indignation felt by many Lithuanian communists as a result of the policy of compromises and unscrupulous concessions conducted by the leadership of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

PRAVDA on 'Political Marathon' in Lithuania

PM2703211590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 Second Edition p 3

["Topical Reportage" by special correspondent Yu. Shabanov: "Marathon Continues"]

[Text] Vilnius, 27 Mar—Many inhabitants of Vilnius spent a traditional Sunday out in the country. Fortunately, the weather was lovely.

However, even bad weather could hardly have kept the city residents at home. Worn out by six days of political passions, they simply had to spend at least a day somewhere in peace and quiet. However, on Monday political life again raced off on another circuit.

Deputies hurried to the Supreme Soviet to continue to form the cabinet. As usual, V. Landsbergis made a statement on the situation in the republic, insisting in particular on the need for talks with Moscow. Well, despite the expectations of the Lithuanian parliamentarians, Western countries are in no hurry to recognize the newfound state and to shower it with a cornucopia of goodies. Is this perhaps why deputies are, as if clutching at a straw, making the most of every news agency report citing official or semiofficial sources or even private individuals expressing at least partial solidarity with the decision of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet on independence? Thus even V. Landsbergis, eagerly pointing to the text of a report, told me in conversation:

"Look, the president of France supports the idea of Lithuania's independence and says that it is important not to add fuel to the flames..."

I do not know whether carelessness or lack of scruple on the part of the aides of the chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet was to blame, but one very important detail was missing from the text. As reported on "Vremya," Francois Mitterrand emphasized that he sees Lithuania as part of the USSR.

We talked in low voices on the back benches of the parliament hall while the next ministerial candidate was on the rostrum. Please note that the atmosphere is so democratic that a journalist can simply have a chat with the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, which I duly appreciated. So the deputies were asking questions, and the would-be minister was answering. It has to be noted that there are fewer and fewer facetious or downright provocative questions on the lines of "Will membership of the Lithuanian Communist Party prevent you from carrying out your official duties?" In recent days there were plenty of them. But is it a serious proposition to give the portfolio of the minister of culture and public education to a man who graduated from the philosophical faculty only four years ago, managed to work for two years as an assistant in the department, and spent a similar time on academic studies? Hardly.

Inevitably, you ask yourself: If the deputies are not concerned with the professional qualifications of the future minister, what is their criterion—his ideological persuasions, perhaps? How familiar all this sounds: Not so long ago we appointed on the basis of ideological persuasion, (that is, party membership) enterprise directors and sector leaders whose professional competence was nil.

A plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee which discussed the question of the party's place in society was held in parallel with the parliament session. The report by Central Committee First Secretary A. Brazauskas honestly admitted: The Lithuanian Communist Party lost the elections to the Supreme Soviet and local soviets, and the exodus from the party is continuing. What are the reasons? Clearly, this has yet to be analyzed. Was not the split one of them? While the communists were resolving their own internal problems, "Sajudis" firmly ensconced itself in power. However, it is possible that after the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party Congress just one Communist Party will be left in the republic. The first secretary raised the question of changing the party's name. Some speeches clearly voiced a call to espouse a social democratic platform. True, not everyone supported this idea.

As the plenum was taking place, pickets gathered outside the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee building. They spoke of returning Lithuania to the family of USSR peoples and of discrimination against the Russian-speaking population in the republic. They also had vigorous opponents.

In the Oktyabrskiy Party Rayon Committee building M. Murokyavichus, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee, addressed party organization secretaries. The talk there was of the need to strengthen the positions of the Committee of USSR Citizens in Lithuania and to uphold the equality of all nationalities in the republic.

Toward evening a helicopter circled over Vilnius. Leaflets floated down like snowflakes. The Committee of

USSR Citizens in Lithuania called on the city residents to go to a rally aimed at protesting possible repressions in connection with the discussion in the Supreme Soviet of provisions regarding criminal liability for antistate appeals.

The political marathon continues.

Lithuanian Ministers Meet With Senator Kennedy

LD2703224190 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] In Moscow today, deputies to the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic, Egidijus Bickauskas and Bronius Kuzmickas, had a meeting with the U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy. The talks lasted about 40 minutes.

As Egidijus Bickauskas informed Radio Vilnius by telephone from Moscow, the Senator inquired about the situation in Lithuania. He said, however, that he had touched upon the issue of Lithuania in his talks with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and that he had been outspoken. He had also referred to the resolution passed by the U.S. Senate in support of the restoration of the Lithuanian state.

In their talks with Edward Kennedy the Lithuanian ministers of parliament raised the issue of the use of Soviet military force in Lithuania. The Senator reaffirmed that during his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev this issue had been dealt with. The Soviet President assured the Senator that the Soviet Union would not resort to military force unless the situation posed a threat to the citizens of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, unless (?calm was breached) and so on and so forth.

The Lithuanian ministers of parliament informed the Senator that military force was being used already. This was strikingly proved by tonight's incidents in Lithuania.

The most important result of the meeting with Senator Kennedy is that he has agreed to mediate between the Lithuanian government and Moscow in establishing contacts and bringing about negotiations. As Egidijus Bickuaskas put it, in the current political situation, that was the most realistic version of assistance.

Vilnius Radio Continues 27 Mar Council Session

Minister of Communication Confirmed

LD2703153690

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1320 GMT resumes its live relay of the Supreme Council session in Vilnius when the announcer observes that some of the deputies are watching a rally taking place outside the Supreme Council building. He notes that the rally is attended by several thousands of people, some carrying red flags, but not much enthusiasm is evident.

At 1322 Deputy Prime Minister Ozolas proposes Kostas Birulis to the post of minister of communications. He does not provide the candidate's biography and no questions are asked about the candidature.

At 1331 Engineer Kostas Birulis makes a statement stressing the importance of establishing communications with Poland and relations with foreign firms. The issuing of postage stamps is not possible because they would not be recognized at present abroad, he says.

At 1337 the deputies question candidate minister Birulis.

At 1352 Kostas Birulis, 65 years of age, is confirmed in the post of minister of communications by a majority of votes.

At 1355 Landsbergis makes a statement on the political situation and reads messages from the Moscow City Soviet deputies to the people of Lithuania and to USSR President Gorbachev. The text of the messages are read in Russian.

At 1405 various procedural problems are discussed.

At 1407 GMT the session is adjourned until 0700 GMT 28 March.

Landsbergis Addresses 27 Mar Council Session

LD2703155390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1355 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Statement by Lithuanian President Vytautis Landsbergis at Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live relay]

[Text] Esteemed deputies, I would like to briefly inform you what is new in the world as far as we are concerned. At this moment many Lithuanians in the United States are travelling to Washington from various parts of the country. A very large congress is planned. It will submit demands to the White House to support the independent Lithuanian Republic and to recognize its government.

Algis Pocevicius, chairman of the [Lithuanian] Community [in North America], phoned just now from Canada. He is flying to Ottawa together with representatives of all national communities to support independent Lithuania and to demand that the government recognizes it. He said that my words to an American radio station about whether the United States would sell out on us for a second time or not has echoed very widely. Maybe, this will help our efforts.

Meanwhile, TASS reports from the White House confirm—this was yesterday—that the United States was still asleep and did not feel very much what was happening here, and repeated invitations to start peaceful dialogue to solve this problem. The Soviet side has assured us publicly and privately that it was not preparing to use military force. We know that this has happened, and a very worrying statement by Gorbachev

was cited yesterday. But we already know that attempts to compel or intimidate the Lithuanian nation can only lead to negative results.

But a statement by President Bush, carried in the British newspaper THE TIMES, which was described by an unnamed high-ranking U.S. official, that Bush is determined to sacrifice future agreements on arms control and trade agreements with the Soviet Union if Moscow uses force, is maybe, the most important. This is, maybe, one of the most serious such statements.

TASS is also publishing alleged statements about Lithuania from Latin American countries. I say alleged, perhaps they are true, but they are all from second-rate figures, leaders of workers' organizations, or similar, of the trends unknown to us. They condemn Lithuania, say that President Gorbachev is correct, and so on. This is destined for internal use, to convince the Soviet Union's citizens that the world supports the Soviet Union in this problem. Hardly anyone can be convinced by this, like a meeting here whose organizers think that they speak on behalf of [words indistinct] nationality, on behalf of the Lithuanian citizens.

A very significant telegram came today addressed to me from the newly elected Moscow City Soviet, where the democrats, representatives of democratic forces, have achieved a very important victory. If you do not mind, I will read it in Russian:

We, people's deputies of the Moscow Soviet of the 21st convocation, support the aspiration of the Lithuanian people for independence and self-determination. We consider impermissible the forcible retention of your people and state within the USSR.

Recognizing that a people that oppresses other peoples cannot be free, we condemn the interference of the USSR president and the USSR Government in the internal affairs of your republic. We hope for wisdom from our leadership and for the speediest settlement of all matters in dispute between Lithuania and the USSR by means of negotiations. We wish you and the entire Lithuanian people success in the rebirth of your country.

There are 71 signatures. [applause]

I can also acquaint you with a telegram to the Soviet Union's president, M.S. Gorbachev, from the Moscow City Soviet of people's deputies:

[Landsbergis reads in Russian] We, people's deputies of the Moscow City Soviet of the 21st convocation, express our disagreement with the policy being conducted by you in relation to Lithuania. Your decree of 21 March violates the right of republics to free secession from the USSR, in accordance with the USSR Constitution.

We consider that your actions and statements, just like the actions of the Communist Party of Lithuania on the platform of the CPSU, amount to a challenge to the Lithuanian people, intensify tension in Lithuania, and represent a serious danger for the peaceful development of the political process in our country.

Therefore, we demand respect for the sovereignty of the Lithuanian state, a halt to any interference in its internal affairs, and the withdrawal of union troops from its territory. [applause]

We are convinced that all matters of dispute connected with the separation of Lithuania from the USSR should be decided only at the negotiating table. [dated] 26 March. [applause]

There are 75 signatures under this telegram. This is good news not only for us but also for Russia and other nations that are striving for freedom and democracy. I wanted to share this with you. Thank you.

Text of Landsbergis, Prunskiene Note to Gorbachev

LD2703173290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1217 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Statement from the Lithuanian Government to President Mikhail Gorbachev and the USSR Government read by unidentified speaker at the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius—live in Lithuanian with simultaneous Russian translation]

[Text] Esteemed deputies: I would like to acquaint you with a statement by the Lithuanian government.

High government statement, USSR, Moscow, Kremlin;

To the president of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev, and to the Soviet Government:

The Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic and the government categorically protest the actions of the USSR Armed Forces on the territory of the republic which savagely violate order, constantly demonstrate military force, and blackmail with the threat of interference of the Armed Forces. The military is occupying civilian sites, violating the laws. This especially is emphasized by the seizure of young men of Lithuiania at night, who were under the banner of the Red Cross. This is evidence that on the territory of Lithuania the occupier is able to throw his weight around with impunity. This is a continuation of the aggression of 1940 against the Lithuanian state. Based on the facts set out, the government of Lithuanian demands the return of the seized citizens, recalls from Moscow its representatives, the former deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and demands negotiations to be conducted on neutral territory. Lithuania is an unarmed, peaceful state; it can oppose an aggressor only by moral force and not by resistance (?to evil).

[Signed]Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic;
Kazimiera Prunskiene, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian Republic.

Internal Affairs Minister Addresses Council

LD2703105890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0750 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Statement by Internal Affairs Minister Misiukonis at the Lithuanian Supreme Council Session in Vilnius—live relay]

[Text] At 1600, in Tarybu Aikste [passage indistinct]. It is expected that the meeting will be peaceful, not directed at any occupation of buildings or against any person or a group of people. During the meeting a view will be expressed on the current situation. The organizers of the meeting—we do not know who they are, but our militiamen had contacts with some people—have assured us that they would maintain public order and would not allow any provocations. Militiamen will also be prepared so as to ensure that there will be no provocations, and also to help make sure we do not react to any provocations.

I would like to add that (Sruogis), one of our militia officials, was today beaten up by soldiers. He was injured—concussion was diagnosed by the physicians. His gun was taken away from him, but later returned. Investigations by the procuracy and internal affairs bodies are under way.

I wish to state that this morning a delegation of militia workers visited me. They stated that the militia is not able to resist a well-armed regular army. I would ask the parliament, first of all, to find or seek the opportunities for acting in a more active manner in this regard, also among the people, among the urban population, in the workers' collectives, so that we can eliminate a number of causes which concern us.

Prosecutor Gives Account of Hospital Raids

LD2703142290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1202 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Statement by Lithuanian Prosecutor General Arturas Paulauskas at the Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live relay]

[Text] Esteemed chairman, esteemed deputies. An invitation group has just returned from the psychiatric hospital in Najoji Vilnia. It went there to investigate the events that took place there and that were reported to you by esteemed Misiukonis, minister of internal affairs, this morning.

I would like to give a more detailed account of what we managed to establish during the first part of our investigation. We would also like to give a legal assessment of these actions.

As you know, on 22 March, by order of the Ministry of Health, Department No. 9 of the psychiatric hospital was subordinated to the needs of soldiers who have left the Soviet Armed Forces. This was testified by the flag of the Red Cross that was raised outside. At 0230 this morning a military unit broke into the hospital grounds in two Ural vehicles. They were in military uniform but without military insignia. According to the evidence of members of the hospital staff, three of the servicemen were wearing sports clothing. Some of the soldiers remained in the trucks and about 20 others under the command of an officer, he was wearing an anorak, broke into the hospital premises on the second floor.

The psychiatrist and a man, both of whom were on duty, were locked in separate rooms. Following this, with the help of crowbars that they had brought with them, the troops broke down the doors of the wards and dragged out the young men who were there. They were wearing hospital gowns. There were 38 young men in the ward, some of them saw the military vehicles arrive in the hospital grounds and managed to escape from the area with the help of nurses. They are now hiding in the area of Vilnius Rayon. A total of 26 young men escaped and 12 remained in the ward. These 12 young men had their arms twisted and they were beaten as they were being taken up the stairs. The procurator testified that blood stains were found on the stairs.

The fact that they were beaten but did not resist was witnessed by militia officers, Mr. Frank and Mrs. Kriauciuniene. They reported what they had seen to the militia and to the Supreme Council.

In order to investigate the incident, militia Lieutenant (Skrodys), who was on duty at Najoji Vilnia milita station, and Volonchuk, acting commander of the militia, arrived on the scene. They approached the vehicles and asked where their commanders were. However, the servicemen attacked them and beat them up. When the two men fell to the ground they were disarmed and kicked. When the officer came out of the building he stopped the beating but he gave no explanation, and did not say on whose orders they were acting. They kidnapped the young men and told the militiamen to leave the place.

The two vehicles left for an unknown destination; the location of the kidnapped young men is also not known.

Inspection of the scene revealed that doors were broken and beds overturned. A jacket belonging to Edvardas Zonys was found.

These acts committed by the military are illegal. Looking at it from the legal point of view this kind of action should be carried out in the day time; if any orders of the military procurators office about the arrest of the young men exist, these orders should have been presented to the medical staff of the hospital.

On the other hand [word indistinct] actions are normally carried out by organs of the Interior Ministry. In this case forces of the Soviet military were used for the purpose.

Investigation of the incident is under way currently and the culprits will be revealed.

Last night a similar incident occured at a hospital in Ziegzdriai. Two young men were arrested who had been sent by the military commissariat for treatment. They did not hide from anybody. However, they were also arrested. Today they were returned and are now in the hospital. The rayon procurator has talked to them and investigation of the case is under way.

Brazauskas on Occupation of Party Building

LD2703155490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1209 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Statement by Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and deputy prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius; with simultaneous Russian translation—live relay]

[Text] Esteemed deputies; I am aware that the television is broadcasting the proceedings of our statement, therefore I would like to appeal to the members of the party and to the citizens of Lithuania, and I would also like to make an official statement to the fact that at 0715 today a large group of airborne troops, using force, broke into the building of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee under the command of a lieutenant colonel. They occupied main passages and blocked the door. They have been in the building since morning. When I arrived to work I tried to make contacts and to find out why the troops had occupied the building. I spoke to Medvedev, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on the phone, and he declared that he did not know anything about this. He said he gave no orders for such a move. I received the same answer from Kuzmin, commander in chief of the Baltic Military Area—who is in Riga—when I contacted him. He said that currently General (Beketin) is in Lithuania as acting commander in chief, following yesterday's departure of General Varennikov.

Although I tried to contact him I did not succeed in locating him. The commander of the Vilnius area of (Korchin), for reasons unknown, did not answer the telephone either, therefore I cannot give you any information on who was the initiator of the seizure or who was this [word indistinct] high-ranking person who gave the orders to occupy our building.

We regard this as an act of violence; this is the assessment which was given by the sitting of the Bureau of the Central Committee which has just finished.

I must also inform you that there are attempts and orders to occupy the Klaipeda Party City Committee building. However, the building has not been seized yet, and neither has the House of Political Education, where currently the Great University is still open. It appears that these acts are not straightforward, nor unique. This is an organized seizure of specific buildings.

The buildings of Vilnius Party School, the City Party Committee, and the building of the House of Political Education are already occupied.

Thus, the action is already known to the world. I would like you to hear this information from me, and I want all the communists of Lithuania to hear it.

The Central Committee Secretariat is working normally. No impediments have been made to us. We can contact each other and solve certain problems. We do not start any negotiations because we said that until their are troops present in the building we are not prepared to hold any negotiations.

Secretaries of the CPSU in Lithuania visited me, demanding that I give them the ground and the first floors. We refused to do this. This is the current situation here in Lithuania.

In conclusion I would like to say that we denounce such acts, and we are firmly convinced that calm cannot be maintained by methods such as these among the citizens and the people in the center of Vilnius, specifically because the building is situated in its center. A large crowd of people have gathered, blocking the entrance, and this caused disturbance in the city center. That was my statement.

Council Statement on USSR Security Committee

LD2703172290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0705 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Statement by the Lithuanian Supreme Council read out by Deputy Juknevicius at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—from the live relay]

[Excerpt] A statement by the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania: Various circumstances compel Lithuania's people to collaborate with the USSR Security Committee bodies. Perhaps such people have not always been able to make free decisions and express their will and views. The Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania, in the name of tranquility in Lithuania, addresses such people and states that their previous collaboration with the bodies of the USSR State Security Committee is not binding either legally or morally. Promises or any other obligations given to that service are from now on invalid.

Therefore the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania invites all persons, collaborators with the USSR State Security Committee, to decide by 31 March to not render help to the bodies of the USSR State Security Committee. We assure that persons who did not commit serious crimes against the inhabitants of Lithuania or give up their ties with the USSR State Security Committee—including their families and those close to them—will not experience any moral, legal, or any other persecutions by the republican government. Their names contained on the lists of secret informers

will never be published officially—or confirmed if they are published in any other way.

But if secret informers of the State Security Committee stand for elections as deputies to the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania, or claim to become ministers or leaders of the state service, information on hand about their relations with the USSR State Security Committee can be made public.

Further cooperation by the inhabitants of Lithuania with the offices of the USSR State Security Committee and their officials after 31 March of this year will be regarded as harmful activity to the interests of the restored Lithuanian Republic and punished in accordance with the law. [passage omitted]

Appeals Issued at 27 Mar Council Session

To Helsinki Act Signatories

LD2703175390 Lithuanian Domestic Service in Russian 1245 GMT 27 Mar 90

["Text" of appeal from the Lithuanian Supreme Council to the signatory parliaments and governments of the Helsinki Final Act, read by Lithuanian President Vytautis Landsbergis at the Lithuanian Supreme Council Session Vilnius—live in Lithuanian with simultaneous Russian translation]

[Text] The Armed Forces of the Soviet Union are carrying out military aggression against independent Lithuania. Citizens who are under the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent are being seized. There are reprisals against militiamen who are fulfilling their service duty. When the Armed Forces of the USSR carry out such actions on their territory they are qualified as anticonstitutional, contrary to the laws of the USSR. Such behavior by the USSR Armed Forces on the territory of independent Lithuania is a clear violation of the principles of international law, sovereignty, inviolability, and noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries, a violation of human and civil rights. The government of the Lithuanian Republic has demanded that the Government of the Soviet Union immediately halt the aggressive actions of the USSR Armed Forces and return the seized citizens.

The Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [as heard] ask the states which signed the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to do everything to get a halt to the aggressive actions against the Lithuanian Republic. [The appeal was passed by 93 votes to none, with no abstentions]

To Physicians of the World

LD2703175190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1232 GMT 27 Mar 90

["Appeal" to the physicians of the world from the Union of Lithuanian Physicians read by Deputy Doctor Vitalijus Andriukaitis at the Lithuanian Supreme Council Session in Vilnius—live in Lithuanian with simultaneous Russian translation]

[Text] To the physicians of the world: On the night of 27 March, 1990 armed units of USSR paratroopers forced their way into two major psychiatric hospitals of the republic of Lithuania.

Using brute force they overwhelmed the premises, assaulted and took away with them to an unknown destination 14 patients. The entire staff and 2500 patients were awakened and frightened by this inhuman behavior.

We, the physicians of Lithuania, are unaware of any similar behavior by an occupation army in the history of civilized nations with respect to patients and medical personnel even under war conditions. This constitutes an unheard of act of vandalism and an offense against humanity.

We appeal to you to condemn this act and to help us in any manner possible.
Signed, Lithuanian Physicians Union.

The appeal was adopted on 27 March, 1990 at an urgent meeting of the Administration of Lithuanian Physicians Union.

Scientists Appeal to World Intellectuals

LD2803102190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Report from Sajudis Information Agency]

[Text] The Lithuanian Scientists' Union has addressed an appeal to the world scientists and intellectuals which states:

In view of the emerged danger Lithuania's scientists resolutely protest against the violence carried out by the Army and ask scientists and cultural workers of the whole world to appeal to their governments to prevent the massacre of the Lithuanian state and its culture. Only the immediate recognition of the Lithuanian state on an international scale, only a strong demand by all nations of the world to stop the violence and threats can save Lithuania from aggression, and its people from new murders and terror. We hope that the world scientists and intellectuals will do everything to stop the iron fist raised against Lithuania.

Appeals to U.S., World Trade Unions for Support

LD2803093690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0734 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Statement by Deputy Kazimieras Uoka at the Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] I would like to inform you on what is being done in asking trade unions to help us. Yesterday the provisional coordinating committee of the Lithuanian trade unions published an appeal to the world trade unions asking their help by every means in the resortation of the republic of Lithuania and in its international recognition.

I personally appealed to the president of the American Labor Union, Lane Kirkland—this union has 14 million members—and asked him to help, through his government, in the recognition of the republic of Lithuania. Since our chairman Vytautas Landsbergis knows him personally, he sent his letter to him.

An appeal has been also made to General Secretary of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, John Vanderveken; this organization has 92 million members. It was asked to help our efforts by every means.

I also would like to inform you that we have here in the hall guests from Kaliningrad: three USSR people's deputies [words indistinct] [applause]. There are also in the hall three newly elected Kaliningrad oblast deputies: Semenov, Ivanova, and Fedorov. [applause]. There are also three candidates to the Kaliningrad town soviet, who, we hope, will be elected. [passage omitted] We also have in the hall several deputies from Leningrad, but they will address us later and I am not going to introduce them.

Vilnius Students Issue Appeal to Gorbachev

LD2803105990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Report from Sajudis Information Agency]

[Text] Four hundred and sixty students at the Vilnius Institute of Construction and Engineering have signed appeals to the World Progressive Youth, the Red Cross, and Gorbachev. In their appeal to Gorbachev, students demand that all young people serving in the Soviet Army be returned to Lithuania, acts of vandalism carried out by the Soviet Army in Lithuania be stopped, and negotiations with Vilnius be started immediately.

Journalists Warned Against 'Provocations'

LD2703125890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1038 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Statements to journalists by Romualdas Ozolas and unidentified speaker in Vilnius with passage-by-passage translation into English—live relay; transcribed from the English; followed by appeal read by announcer in Lithuanian]

[Text] [Ozolas] We have information that there may be, that certain actions may be provoked with regard to this building [of the Supreme Council] and people inside it. If this doesn't happen, then good, it'll be good. But if something does happen please (?focus on it) very precisely and please show the world how it is done.

Our request is this, the following: Not to be in such a place and in such a situation that you could be a reason for provocation. The mass meeting is planned for 1600. The center of it should be around the library which is beside the Supreme Council building. But if there are a lot of people it is quite possible that (?masses of people) will move toward the building of the Supreme Council.

If actions are provoked to the point that people try to enter the building, even perhaps through the windows, it would be good that you fixate this fact very clearly. So I suggest that your participation or mingling in the meeting itself be minimal and presence in the building be maximal. And there are a few other objects that, (?let me) summarize what I just said in Russian for the benefit of Russian speakers. [repeats previous passage in Russian]

[Unidentified speaker] I also join in asking you, with Mr. Ozolas, asking the correspondents to be extremely careful today, because we have already had experience of journalists becoming the victims of provocations. Although there is no very firm basis for being disquieted about these events, the republican militia has promised to guard the building. They have allotted 200 militamen to this task.

We have information that during this mass meeting there will be first of all an attempt to provoke members of the militia themselves, to create a similar situation to that which took place on 28 September last year, which would create the possibility to accuse the government of using force against civilians. You perhaps know that after the violent incidents of 28 September 1988, not last year but 1988, after militia used violence against civilians, certain members of the government were removed.

We even know about the possible variants or varieties of provocations that may be used. That is why we are telling you in advance. That is why we should tell you that the militia will have no other weapons except for police sticks. Every use of a firearm is a provocation and that will be done—but certainly not be done by anybody on our side.

We have also placed the television committee building under protection, the post office and telegraph building, and the central telephone station. These buildings have been entrusted to the protection of the republican militia and Internal Affairs Minister Misuikonis.

[Announcer] Dear people of Lithuania. I wish only to remind you of wise and beautiful words: A blind king is

intruding by force to govern us. But we, who can see, will be victorious because we are right. Then let us be dignified, proud, concentrated, and calm.

Gorbachev Decrees on Lithuania Appraised

PM2703161790 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 28 Mar 90 p 3

[Unattributed "RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA Mini-Poll": "Utmost Tolerance and Restraint"—first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] *It is well known that the country's President M.S. Gorbachev adopted a series of decrees concerning the situation in Lithuania. We decided to find out the response of USSR people's deputies to these decrees.*

K. LUBENCHENKO: Indeed, the Lithuanian people have the right to the republic's secession from the USSR, and it is thus legitimate to raise the question. But the section of the population which cannot be classed as Lithuanian—the representatives of other nationalities—must not be forgotten, either.

Whenever there is talk about separating one territory from another or about gaining an independent status, no matter what form this may take, it is always important to ensure that the interests of the sides are observed during such a transition. Therefore, the preparation of such a process demands time, mutual discussions and coordination, and the elaboration of positions.

When the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies adopted the resolution on Lithuania's international and internal status, I abstained from voting. I did not have sufficient information to make a decision. In these circumstances, I would not like to raise doubts about the the president's actions—I think that he has sufficient information.

I. GRYAZIN: I have no doubts about the presidential decrees as a method for the political settlement of the conflict which has developed. The following, however, is a different question: What is the content of these decrees? I will make no secret of the fact that here, in my capacity as jurist and deputy, I have some quite serious complaints. For example, one of the latest decrees specifically said that the determination of responsibility for state crimes is the prerogative of union authorities. But is this really so? The USSR Constitution does not grant such power to a single union organ, not even to the president.

This political confrontation must somehow be resolved but, I hope, there will be no need to resort to any—not even indirect—means of military threat. This can only have the effect of a provocation and aggravate the situation. It would be easy for us, residents of neighboring Estonia, to criticize Lithuania now, seeing that we are developing at a more moderate pace. Lithuania was hoping to restore its statehood by parliamentary means. And now an obstacle—the presidential institution—has suddenly blocked this generally speaking tranquil path. Therefore, the only way is via talks with the president of the USSR. There cannot be even a shadow of a doubt regarding M.S. Gorbachev's democratism and the progressiveness of his views. But he is quite often let down by his advisers, especially in the sphere of nationalities policy. It is sufficient to recall the way questions around Nagorno-Karabakh were resolved in order to be convinced of this.

A. YEMELYANOV: The main point in this situation is to find some sort of mutually acceptable way out. This means calm, composure, mutual contacts. Any "slanging match" could lead to exacerbation.

It is necessary to proceed from the premise that the attempted Lithuanian "coup" was no surprise for us. But was anything done to prevent it? I have already spoken about our tardiness and sluggishness a few days ago, when we were discussing the draft law "On General Principles of the Leadership of the Economy and Social Sphere in Union and Autonomous Republics." Does this draft law enable union and autonomous republics to enjoy autonomy in the solution of economic and social questions like real masters, without resorting to secession from the Union for this autonomy's sake? On studying the situation in the last few years, I arrived at the conclusion that today's centrifugal events are largely attributable to the inertia and immobility of the center, to its delayed reaction to demands from below. No matter which aspect you take, including questions concerning the republics' economic autonomy, the center initially rejects their demands, then leans toward dialogue, and finally begins to patch and "darn" the resulting holes and tears. Meanwhile the train has departed and we begin to produce partial solutions only while running after it.

We have always built relations between the republics and the center on the principle "from the top downward," which was reflected in the well known formula "strong center—strong republics." We proved totally incapable of abandoning this formula for a long time. Even though theoretically everything ought to be the other way round.

I recall 1988, when I traveled to Lithuania as member of the team to discuss documents there. This is how the problem was presented: Establish from the start what should be given to the center, and all the rest will follow. And yet it is necessary to begin with the master, with those who work and dispose of the output they produce.

The question now is that secession as such from a country where we have lived together for such a long time is a complex matter. And even if some forces differ, everything should be done properly, without hysterics. The Lithuanians should wait a little and thoroughly weigh everything. We are talking about more flexible forms of our union state, about a balanced and calm appraisal of everything that is being done, about meeting each other halfway.

Swedish Reporter on Russian Demonstration

LD2703175990 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1600 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Excerpt] For the time being Lithuania is a forbidden zone for foreigners. This was stated by a representative of the Soviet Foreign Ministry today. Journalists and others who are already in the country may stay until their permits run out, but then they must leave Lithuania. Today—after last night's military intervention—a group of communists loyal to Moscow protested against the struggle for independence. They demonstrated outside the legislature building in Vilnius. Many feared clashes, but it passed off peacefully, reports the "Eko" correspondent in Vilnius [Vladislav Savic]:

[Begin recording] The meeting, arranged by the small Communist Party loyal to Moscow, did not lead to any provocations, either from the Lithuanian population or from the Russian-speaking groups who to a large extent support the party loyal to Moscow. It seems that both sides wanted to avoid confrontation. The Lithuanian government urged the population both yesterday and today not to attend the meeting. Since the demonstration took place right outside the legislature, and President Vytautas Landsbergis warned that there were plans for some of the demonstrators to try to enter the legislature to provoke a fight, the legislature decided that all female staff should leave the building. In addition, riot-fences were put up right around the building. But either the threat was exaggerated or the Lithuanian government succeeded in its attempt to urge calm. There were few Lithuanians among the approximately 7,000 to 8,000 demonstrators, even though shrill whistles could be heard during some of the speeches and the Soviet national anthem. The meeting about which everyone had warned ended peacefully, after an otherwise dramatic day. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Lithuanian Prime Minister Views Polish Ties

LD2703225290 Warsaw PAP in English 2158 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Vilnius, March 27—"The Soviet Union is a state which is very sensitive to the voice of global public opinion. Owing to his position and internal situation, Gorbachev cannot recognize our state, but in his speeches always leaves the door slightly open to allow us to proceed forward. Our deputies who yet before March 11 held preliminary talks with Gorbachev on our independence had the impression that he was willing to accept Lithuania as a separate state as well as its seccession from the USSR," prime minister of the Lithuanian government Mrs. Kazimiera-Danute Prunskiene stated in an exclusive interview for PAP. Speaking about Polish-Lithuanian relations in the context of the present situation in Europe, Mrs Prunskiene stated in part:

"Many matters remain unclear in Polish-Lithuanian relations. Lack of full clarity always hampers the solution of concrete problems. That is why it would be unnatural if representatives of our two states did not sit down to talks in the nearest future. I agree with the opinion that Poland really is a bridge between the West and East but Lithuania is precisely an extension of this bridge.

"Our key goal is to stabilize the internal situation in Lithuania which will bear impact on a stabilization of the situation in the broader context, not only in Lithuania. At present a certain destabilizing role in our republic is played not so much by the Polish population in Lithuania but by attempts to use the Polish population and all the difficult problems inherited from the old system by both Lithuanians and Poles. Certain people are trying to use this situation through provocative action in the interest of by no means the Poles who live here and Poland itself but on the contrary, rather in the interest of Moscow."

Poland's Geremek Urges 'Dialogue' in Lithuania

LD2703205290 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1730 GMT 27 Mar 90

[no video available]

[Text] A 10-man delegation of the Citizen's Parliamentary Floor Group, [OKP] with Professor Bronislaw Geremek, is in Vilnius.

[Begin Geremek recording] We are bringing a very special message. We bring the message that violent means are ineffective. Martial law does not change political problems, it does not resolve conflicts, we know this. We also know that only political dialogue can solve political conflicts. This means that in the present situation only talks between the USSR leadership and the Lithuanian leadership can and should bring about some kind of solution to this dispute.

There is one thing (?which there is no doubt about whatsoever), and that is that the Lithuanians have a right to independence, to a free state; and this right also concerns our compatriots who live on Lithuanian soil. After all, there are more than 300,000 Poles here. We bring our message about Lithuania's right to freedom both to the Lithuanians and the Poles. [end recording]

Warsaw Embassy Official Discusses Lithuania

LD2703200190 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] At the Soviet Embassy in Warsaw, Political Councillor Nikolay Krutyuk presented to journalists the Soviet stand on Lithuania. Here are some excerpts:

[Begin Krutyuk recording] The USSR assumes as its fundamental stand the right of nations to self-determination confirmed in the due regulations of the Soviet Constitution. This right should not be implemented in the way which damages the interests of nations of our Federation, including the Lithuanian Soviet Republic. It is incomprehensible that there are attempts by certain circles abroad to take advantage and

to complicate the situation in Lithuania—the situation is exclusively an internal matter of the USSR, and attempts to take advantage of the situation are for the purpose of anti-Soviet propaganda, exacerbating international tension, and damaging the cause of peace.

The situation in Lithuania and around it is dangerous in its implications which may become a destabilizing factor both in Europe and in the whole world. It seems that this does not correspond to mutual interests at a time when Europe is at the stage of a breakthrough and is in a special need for political, economic, and military stability.

The Soviet Union is of the opinion that the Lithuanian legislature has no legal powers to void the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 1 August 1940 about the acceptance of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Also, the Lithuanian legislature has no legal powers to prevent the jurisdiction of the USSR Constitution on Lithuanian territory. [end recording]

Polish-Lithuanian Communique Issued in Vilnius

LD2703225890 Warsaw PAP in English 2145 GMT 27 Mar 90

["Joint Polish-Lithuanian Communique (abridged)"—PAP headline]

[Text] Vilnius, March 27—A delegation of the Citizen's Parliamentary Floor Group [OKP] today visited Vilnius at the invitation of the Lithuanian parliament.

The Polish side referred to the statement of the Polish Senate and Sejm in response to the declaration of the Lithuanian parliament proclaiming the continuity and independence of the Lithuanian state. It once again expressed joy at the return of the Lithuanian nation to the family of free nations and a hope that the just aspirations of Lithuania would be satisfied and that the process of restoring independent statehood would not be disturbed. The OKP delegation assured the Lithuanian side that Poland treated its border with Lithuania as equally final as Poland's western border on the Odra and Nysa Rivers.

Both sides thought that in building a new Europe both Poland and Lithuania faced a chance of settling their mutual relations as well as internal nationality relations in a way which would make them a model for the whole region releasing itself from the shackles of totalitarianism.

In acknowledging the historical need to strengthen ties between Poland and Lithuania, both sides think it purposeful to establish mechanisms of mutual political consultations as well as joint commissions for economic, socio-cultural, historical and youth affairs.

Spain, Italy Urge Caution on Lithuania

LD2803080190 Moscow TASS in English 0719 GMT 28 Mar 90

[by TASS correspondent Robert Serebrennikov]

[Text] Madrid March 28 TASS—The West must be sensitive and not interfere in Soviet internal affairs in connection with developments in Lithuania, Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez and his Italian counterpart Giulio Andreotti told a press conference on the outcome of their talks in Madrid on Tuesday.

Andreotti also met King Juan Carlos the First of Spain.

The sides discussed the future of the European Economic Community in connection with German reunification, security issues, the forthcoming EEC summit in Dublin, and the Common Market's ties with Latin America.

Commenting on developments in Lithuania, Gonzalez said that the West should be extremely cautious in its treatment of "the special situation and its evolution" and try to promote Soviet reforms in the framework of a peaceful dialogue without "any interference that might endanger the process which has become a generator of a new situation in Europe."

Italy is watching developments in Lithuania with "great attention and caution", Andreotti said.

Every nation's aspirations for freedom are absolutely legitimate, but this "should be done through consensus and discussion and without interference and forceful means. Naturally, both sides should show restraint," he said. Saying that German unification is irreversible, Spain and Italy supported the country's integration into the common European process.

Gonzalez and Andreotti called for a Mediterranean security conference.

The two ministers said they did not discuss the transfer of U.S. F-16 fighter-bombers from the Torrejon de Ardoz base near Madrid to the Appennine peninsula to meet Spanish demands sealed in its military accord with the United States.

Lithuania's European Integration Discussed

904A0267A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 22 Mar 90 p 3

[Article by V. Makarchev: "Snare for the Uninitiated"]

[Text] The Lithuanian parliament's promulgation of a declaration on the restoration of state sovereignty has led to the creation of an extremely difficult situation. Without going into the legal aspect, I would like to dwell on the economic aspect of self- determination, toward which "Sajudis" is pushing. In my view, world economic conditions are exceptionally unpropitious for Lithuania.

The world's industrial development has reached a stage in which the functioning of an economy within the

exclusive framework of one small state is today impossible. Lithuania will be forced to seek an alliance with one of the three economic groupings that currently exist in Europe: the EEC, EFTA (European Free Trade Association) and CEMA. Two opposite trends are currently operating in the world economy. On the one hand the process of pulling together national and regional markets into a single world market is under way. On the other, in connection with increased commodity competition there is bitter protection by the economic groupings of their home markets, which is being expressed in a revival of protectionist ideas. A consequence of this contradiction is, for example, the creation of a single internal market within the EEC, and also debate in the U.S. Congress concerning the restriction of imports from Japan. And it is as yet impossible to say which of these trends will prevail even in the next 10 years. All this is exceptionally unfavorable even for the unrestricted fantasy of Lithuania's gaining economic independence, and threatens it with impasse.

In proposing the severance of all ties to the USSR, including economic, the ideologists of state separation point to the EEC as the principal savior of the Lithuanian economy. However, counting on the EEC's permanent financial assistance would be unrealistic.

Only Lithuania's entry into the EEC could provide the sole theoretical basis for economic assistance. This possibility is now being discussed in "Sajudis." But what would such a step mean?

Hotheads in Lithuania are now linking the economic future with an upsurge in agriculture—historically the strongest sector. However, it is with agriculture that entry into the EEC is currently most difficult. The Community's Common Agricultural Policy is going through critical times. Bitter battles are being fought over each 10th of a percent of the agricultural production quota. The overproduction of meat, milk and cereals and their accumulation in EEC warehouses is forcing the European Council to adopt a decision reducing sown areas in the EEC countries. Thus the farmers of France and Britain are currently being paid to take plow land out of circulation and to plant it with forest.

How do you develop the countryside when your competitors are stronger by several orders of magnitude and are keeping vigilant watch to ensure that no one sells at dumping prices?

The European Free Trade Association unites six countries: Switzerland, Austria, Sweden, Finland, Norway and Iceland. In the opinion of a number of Lithuanian economists, it is ideally suited to Lithuania's integration in the capitalist economy. However, the question arises: How sensible would it be to join an organization that is in crisis and is disintegrating through competitive struggle with the EEC? Austria already has one foot in the European Community. The recent merger of the Swedish Volvo concern and the French Renault testifies to the hopelessness of the EFTA structure for big capital. The EFTA's weakness is determined not least by the absence of common executive authorities and of a serious energy base, and the narrowness of the market. Even Switzerland has been forced to relinquish part of its sovereignty in the face of isolation from EEC markets.

Ten to 15 years ago even Lithuania's entry into EFTA would not have given rise to as much doubt as to the expediency of this step. But taking yesterday's train is impossible.

The best economic prospects may, in my view, be afforded the sovereignty of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] by continuing the current economic relations with the USSR. On condition, of course, of the formation of a new all-Union market. The Baltic republics have a unique opportunity to lead the process of formation of this market and to influence its salient features and mechanism.

The crisis currently being experienced by the USSR will inevitably lead to a profound restructuring of the economic mechanism. There is every reason to foresee the appearance on the territory of the present union of a new world economic center which, owing to its natural resources and latent potential, has development prospects in the coming century.

Boldness of thought, political maturity and firmness of mind are necessary, however, for a spurt ahead. As can be seen, the present "Sajudis" leadership is unwilling or unable to assume responsibility for the republic's economic future within the framework of ties to the USSR and is seeking refuge in other structures.

The USSR is moving toward a new union treaty, the broadest economic reform, and most profound democratic changes. They have already begun. And if some people are feverishly lowering the lifeboat from the ship in an attempt to save themselves in isolation, they are running the risk of getting lost in an ocean full of economic storms.

Identity of Army Commander Arouses Concern

LD2703150390 Prague CTK in English 1221 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 27 (CTK correspondent)—The Lithuanian Sajudis movement today confirmed that Soviet Army units attacked last night a psychiatric clinic in Vilnius and dragged off an unidentified number of deserters. The CTK correspondent here was told by Sajudis spokeswoman Judita Miciunin by phone.

The spokeswoman said the Soviet troops occupied the headquarters of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, adding that the situation in Vilnius was very tense. During the attack on the hospital the troops assaulted a cameraman of the U.S. ABC television

network and seized a cassette with a recording of the action. The spokeswoman said that concern is aroused by the fact that the commander of the troops operating in Vilnius also commanded Army actions in Georgia and Azerbaijan.

The building housing the Communist Party Central Committee in Vilnius is guarded by paratroopers, Judita Miciunin said, adding that they let party First Secretary Algirdas Brazauskas and a secretary into the building but prevented them from normal work.

"We expect the television building to be the target of the next attack," Miciunin stated. She said there was general conviction in the city that Mikhail Gorbachev decided to use force in Lithuania.

Lithuanian Run-off Election Results

90UN1285A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 13 Mar 90 p 3

[Unattributed article: "At the Republic Electoral Commission: Election Results for Deputies of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Which Occurred on 7, 8, and 10 March 1990. Published Based on District Electoral Commission Records"]

[Text]

Pagegskiy Electoral District No. 67

Total Number of Voters		17,672.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		14,005.
Number of Invalid Ballots		145.
Candidate	For	Against
Antanas Karoblis	7,162	6,698
Vladas Sturis	6,406	7,454

Antanas KAROBLIS, acting dean of the University imeni Vitautas Velikiy, Kaunas, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Shilalskiy Electoral District No. 70

Total Number of Voters		21,430.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		16,807.
Number of Invalid Ballots		89.
Candidate	For	Against
Valeriyonas Shadreyka	8,442	8,276
Kazis Yuknyus	7,699	9,019

Valeriyonas SHADREYKA, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Lawyers Collegium, Vilnius, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Plungeskiy Electoral District No. 71

Total Number of Voters	19,098.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots	9,725.
Number of Invalid Ballots	37.

Candidate	For	Against
Balis Gauyauskas	4,585	5,103
Aleksandras-Raymondas Kashauskas	4,319	5,369

Balis GAYAUSKAS, a pensioner, Kaunas, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Kretingskiy Electoral District No. 73

Total Number of Voters		15,902.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		9,425.
Number of Invalid Ballots		53.
Candidate	For	Against
Ionas Gelazhyus	2,997	6,375
Virginiyus Pikturna	5,648	3,724

Virginius PIKTURNA, secretary of the Kretingskiy Lithuanian KSM [Komsomol] Raykom, Palanga, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Kartenskiy Electoral District No. 74

Total Number of Voters		15,231.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		12,286.
Number of Invalid Ballots		99.
Candidate	For	Against
Eymontas Grakauskas	8,222	3,965
Valeriyonas Kubilyus	3,575	8,612

Eymontas GRAKAUSKAS, an assistant professor at Republic Agroindustrial Complex Management Higher School, Vilnius, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Telshyayskiy Electoral District No. 80

Total Number of Voters		18,094.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		10,733.
Number of Invalid Ballots		76.
Candidate	For	Against
Yuozas Butkyavichyus	4,743	5,914
Vitautas Puplauskas	5,486	5,171

Vitautas PUPLAUSKAS, chief power engineering specialist of Mastis Telshyayskiy Knitted-Goods Production Association, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Telshyayskyy Rural Electoral District No. 81

Total Number of Voters		17,445.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		12,912.
Number of Invalid Ballots		72.
Candidate	For	Against
Algirdas Kumzha	8,431	4,409
Algirdas Tarvaynis	4,118	8,722

Algirdas KUMZHA, deputy head of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Department, Vilnius, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Arëgalskiy Electoral District No. 85

Total Number of Voters		16,394.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		12,317.
Number of Invalid Ballots		126.
Candidate	For	Against
Arunas Degutis	6,143	6,048
Edmundas Ionila	5,723	6,468

Arunas DEGUTIS, a sculptor at Dayle Vilnius Cooperative Firm of Sculpture, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Sheduvskiy Electoral District No. 90

Total Number of Voters		18,656.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		14,177.
Number of Invalid Ballots		91.
Candidate	For	Against
Kyastutis Rimkus	8,871	5,215
Antanas Stanchikas	4,761	9,325

Kyastutis RIMKUS, chairman of Potsyunelyay Kolkhoz, Radvilishkskiy Rayon, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Birzhayskiky Electoral District No. 97

Total Number of Voters		17,936.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		13,207.
Number of Invalid Ballots		67.
Candidate	For	Against
Birute Valenite	7,282	5,858
Viktoras Rinkyavichyus	5,089	8,051

Birute VALENITE, nursery chief of Birzhayskiy Lespromkhoz, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Aukshtaytiyskiy Electoral District No. 105

Total Number of Voters		18,726.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		14,069.
Number of Invalid Ballots		78.
Candidate	For	Against
Pyatras Galgatavichyus	4,929	9,062
Albertas Mishkinis	8,630	5,361

Albertas MISHKINIS, work superintendent of the Utenskiy Mobile Mechanized Column, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Shvenchënskiy Electoral District No. 110

Total Number of Voters		14,628.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		10,064.
Number of Invalid Ballots		104.
Candidate	For	Against
Ionas Bendoryus	3,886	6,074
Valentina Suboch	5,833	4,127

Valentina SUBOCH, Ispolkom chairman of Shvenchënskiy Rayon Pabradskiy Apilinkovyy Council of People's Deputies, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Rimkayskiy Electoral District No. 120

Total Number of Voters		16,282.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		9,990.
Number of Invalid Ballots		63.
Candidate	For	Against
Stanislovas-Gediminis Ilgunas	5,396	4,531
Ionas-Klemensas Sungayla	3,681	6,246

Stanislovas-Gediminas ILGUNAS, department chief of Khimstroy Ionavskiy Trust, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Nerisskiy Electoral District No. 121

Total Number of Voters		17,627.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		10,486.
Number of Invalid Ballots		79.
Candidate	For	Against
Bronislavas Lubis	5,202	5,205
Edmundas Simanavichyus	4,777	5,630

Bronislavas LUBIS, general director of Azot Ionavskiy Production Association, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Alitusskiy Rural Electoral District No. 136

Total Number of Voters		21,391.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		15,527.
Number of Invalid Ballots		125.
Candidate	For	Against
Ionas Pangonis	10,491	4,911
Rimantas Predkelis	4,336	11,066

Ionas PANGONIS, first deputy general director of the Lithuanian Society of Fruit, Vegetable, and Flower Farming, Alitus, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Lyantvarskiy Electoral District No. 137

Total Number of Voters		18,402.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		8,800.
Number of Invalid Ballots		59.
Candidate	For	Against
Genrik Yankovskiy	3,967	4,774
Romualdas Rudzis	4,409	4,332

Romualdas RUDZIS, chairman of Kaytra Lyantvarskiy Cooperative Production Enterprise, Trakayskiy Rayon, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Trakayskiy Electoral District No. 139		
Total Number of Voters		18,044.
Total Number of Voters Who Cast Ballots		11,632.
Number of Invalid Ballots		91.
Candidate	For	Against
Mariyan-Iosif Adamovich	5,601	5,940
Rimvidas-Raymondas Survila	5,635	5,906

Rimvidas-Raymondas SURVILA, chief animal technician of Vevisskiy Poultry Plant, Trakayskiy Rayon, has been elected a People's Deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Isayev Compares German Reunification, Lithuania

LD2703144890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Yuriy Isayev commentary]

[Excerpts] Without a doubt, the events in Lithuania remain at the center of attention of the mass media in many countries of the world. [passage omitted]

Of course, the issue is a complex one. This process reminds me—if I may put it this way—of the reunification process in Germany, only in reverse. For here we have deunification. And while it seemed at first, immediately after the destruction of the Berlin Wall, that the reunificaiton of the two states was just days off, nowadays the leading politicians in the FRG are putting the date back to 1993, realizing that there are human, economic, and political problems that cannot be resolved in one fell swoop. The very same is happening in Lithuania. In a short space of time, there is no way of breaking the historic, economic, cultural, and social bonds that unite the peoples in our union.

Estonian Body Cables Gorbachev on Lithuania

LD2703110690 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Summary] The board of the Estonian Committee has dispatched a message to Mikhail Gorbachev in which concern is expressed over the situation in Lithuania. The message says that it is time that the USSR Government stopped ignoring the freedom wishes of subjugated peoples.

Estonian Congress 'Defeat' for Communists

90UN1250A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 14 Mar 90 p 3

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent S. Tarakanov: "Pepper Spicing"]

[Text] Morning of Sunday, 11 March. The blue, black, and white national banners flutter on the apartment houses and official buildings of Tallinn. The emblem of the congress of Estonia, at the center of which is the coat of arms of the Estonian Republic, stands out boldly above the entrance to the "Estoniya" Concert Hall. Guards with the symbolic eagle on the sleeves of their coats form a close chain along the front of the theater....

No, this report is by no means about prewar times, I am writing about the present day. And the Congress of Estonia is an event whose significance only time can determine. It was preceded by elections conducted by the main citizens' committee. We have already written about how they were conducted ("Automatic Majority," RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA for 28 February). The results are now known. Of the 700,000 citizens of the Estonian Republic registered by the committees, 557,163 took part in the voting, along with 34,345 persons petitioning to be granted citizenship. Some 499 deputies were elected, of whom 35 are overseas Estonians and 43 are representatives with nonvoting status who are aspiring to citizenship. I have offered these figures with good reason. They are the result of a year's work by the citizens' committees, which made it possible, as the congress said, "for the first time since the occupation and annexation of Estonia by the Soviet Union in 1940 to democratically elect representation of the citizens of the Estonian Republic."

Opening the congress, T. Kelam, chairman of the main citizens' committee, said that until the elimination of the occupation and the convening of a constitutional state duma the congress of Estonia is the highest exponent of state power. It is not an industrial complex for the production of declarations but a real force based on the alternative power structures which have been created.

The congress was in session for two days and ended late in the evening on Monday, 12 March. A mass of documents was adopted. They include declarations and decrees on the authority and rightful succession of the Congress of Estonia, on the forces of occupation of the Soviet Union, on the restoration of the legitimate state power of the Estonian Republic and the program for such restoration, on citizens of other states residing in its territory and on the state border. Within five days these documents will be carried in the press. Briefly about their essence. Their filling is generally identical and, spiced, as they say. This is clearly seen, for example, in the congress' appeal to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Here are its main points: Proceeding from its rightful succession to the Estonian Republic and the Tartu Peace Treaty with Soviet Russia of 2 February 1920 and also the decree of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies of 24 December last year on the political and legal evaluation of 1939 Soviet-German Nonaggression Treaty, the Congress of Estonia proposes an end to the annexation and the withdrawal from the territory of Estonia of the Soviet forces of occupation and the start of immediate negotiations on the restoration of the Estonian Republic.

The declaration on the state border is noteworthy. It says, among other things, that the Congress of Estonia is prepared to enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union on the restoration of the borders determined by

the Tartu Peace Treaty. This is nothing other than a claim on territory which is now part of Pskov and Leningrad oblasts.

An analysis of the documents of the congress of Estonia, even the most detailed, does not with the best will in the world provide a complete picture of the event. This forum goes far beyond the framework of a producer of declarations lacking legal force as yet. And this, in my opinion, is why. It and the Committee of Estonia which it elected have in fact become together with the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet representative bodies formed democratically. It was being conjectured on the eve of the congress that it would call for a boycott of the elections scheduled for 18 March to the Supreme Soviet as a body "serving as a decoration to conceal Moscow's authority" and of which representatives of the "forces of occupation and illegal immigrants" would be members. But this was not the case. T. Kelam explains the situation as follows:

"The unanimity that the congress and the Supreme Soviet do not necessarily have to be in confrontation if their roles are correctly distributed probably came as a surprise. The Supreme Soviet, like other Soviet authorities, is the local self-administration of the Soviet empire. It has its own functions pertaining to the organization of day-to-day life and the preservation of openness. As long as the state of occupation persists, that is, an army of occupation and organs of power similar to it are present, such self- administration is obviously essential. The question is to ensure that they begin sufficiently evidently to serve needs connected with independence, recognizing the authority of the legitimate people's representation. Roles should be allocated between ourselves so as to ensure honest cooperation. And it will be possible only when the attitude toward the most important goals has been ascertained in principle."

As is known, the republic Supreme Soviet set up a commission on Estonia's economic and political independence for negotiating with the center. Representatives of the main citizens' committee declined to take part. They are now prepared to form a delegation which has representatives from both parties.

And a final, very distressing point for the republic's communists. The Congress of Estonia cannot, in my view, be seen as anything other than a defeat for them. The mistake of viewing the activity of the citizens' committees as a propaganda campaign to attract supporters is now obvious. The political forces opposed to the Communist Party made most effective use of the Estonian people's aspiration to state independence.

WA2703191490 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 14 Mar 90 p 3

A meeting of communist delegates was held in the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee the day before the opening of the congress. But their voices were not audible at the congress even when a call for the Communist Party to be recognized as a "criminal terrorist organization" was heard. In addition, some of them have joined the permanent Committee of Estonia formed by the congress. The communists' lack of voice in such a situation is a harbinger of ideological battles at the coming 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress.

Five percent of the nonindigenous inhabitants of the republic took part in the elections to the Congress of Estonia. What do the rest say? It is planned to hold in Tallinn on 14 March a republic meeting organized by the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Power and Civil Rights and the political forces supporting it.

Estonian Deputies Discuss Party Split

LD2703183790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Video report by special correspondents B. Barkhatov and A. Vaskin in Tallinn, from the "Vremya" newscast—correspondents not individually identifiable]

[Text] [Announcer] As is known, the 20th Congress of the Estonian Communist Party occurred during a difficult political struggle. A section of deputies with the strategy of the party as determined by the congress. Take a look at a report by our special correspondents in Tallinn:

[Video shows meeting, participants raising hands, participants dispersing] [Correspondent] Already at the time of voting for the program of the Communist Party of Estonia a separation took place of a significant group of delegates—around 130 people—let's put it that way, from the majority. Because of their conferences during congress breaks and also the meeting at night on the final day after the official presidium left the hall, commentaries in republican newspapers and on radio have already named them the night party, the 15-minute faction or the party of Gusev and Panfilov, the surnames of the leaders. And here is the essence of the situation which developed yesterday, according to a representative of that same minority in disagreement:

[P.N. Panfilov] After program documents connected with the formation of a new independent Communist Party of Estonia were adopted, the delegates continued the work of that congress and working normally, normally, they created their Central Committee. At the same time two secretaries of the Central Committee were elected, one of those secretaries being me, and today our delegates, members of the Central Committee who were elected yesterday, have dispersed to labor collectives, to primary party organizations, and are explaining the situation which has come about today in the Communist Party of Estonia.

[Correspondent] Approximately how many communists have been united under the motto, in line with the principle, of delegates that took part in that night session?

[Panfilov] Around 30,000.

[Correspondent] Communists?

[Second correspondent] Is it absolutely accurate that delegates from your, so to speak, group will be at the 28th congress?

[Panfilov] Yes. Nine people will definitely be at the 28th CPSU Congress.

[Correspondent] Yesterday at a news conference in the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party, secretaries of the Central Committee, comrades Sillari and (Roots), stated that for the sake of the general idea of civil peace, it is of course essential to maintain contacts with the group that has formed and that has elected its own Central Committee. A policy of closed doors is not a method, but the creation of some kind of coalition Central Committee is out of the question. One must not think, stressed comrade (Roots), that the Estonian Communist Party has devided into two wings. It is more accurate and more honest to admit that to judge from everything these are two different parties. But ahead lies a transition period designated by the congress. There is time to think for both sides. [video shows news conference]

Estonian Communist Interviewed on Party Split

LD2703190190 Moscow TASS in English 1751 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Tallinn March 27 TASS—At the 20th Congress of the Estonian Communist Party that ended here, a group of delegates that does not agree with the congress's decision to form an Independent Communist Party set up the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party on the platform of the Soviet Communist Party.

"Our purpose is to prevent the Independent Estonian Communist Party from interfering with organisations of the Estonian party that adhere to the platform of the Soviet Communist Party," Genhik Israelian, member of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party on the platform of the Soviet Communist Party, told TASS.

He believes that the "Lithuanian variant" will not be repeated in Estonia, although there are some grounds for comparison.

Admitting that there are extremists on both sides, Israelian emphasized the readiness of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party on the Platform of the CPSU for reciprocal steps.

"We have not made calls for a split, for a withdrawal from the Estonian Communist Party. We called for unity. We said that in this lies our strength. Regrettably, we had no support from the other side," Israelian said.

New Director for Estonian Telegraph Agency

LD2703232290 Tallin RAHVA HAAL in Estonian 27 Mar p. 2

[Summary] Aimar Jugaste, new director of the Estonian Telegraph Agency, says that work contracts have recently been signed with two Swedish agencies—Reportagebild AB and Tidningarnas Telegrambyra—and that ETA intends to remain independent in its work of any political parties.

RSFSR

RSFSR Local Election Results Summarized

LD2703131390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1003 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS)—We are transmitting a report by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium on the results of the repeat ballot in the elections of people's deputies of autonomous republics and local soviets of people's deputies of the RSFSR:

The conducting of a repeat ballot in the elections of people's deputies of local soviets was completed on 18 March on the territory of the RSFSR.

The ballot was carried out in 42,166 constituencies at all levels of local soviets, including in 640 constituencies of kray soviets, 4,260 of oblast soviets, 118 of oblast soviets of autonomous oblasts; in 270 constituencies of okrug soviets of autonomous okrugs, 6,633 of rayon soviets, 16,151 of town soviets and 6,181 of town rayon soviets; in 3,010 constituencies of village soviets and 4,903 of rural soviets of people's deputies.

Thirty-two million nine hundred thousand voters took part in the repeat ballot, or 65.8 percent of those on the electoral list. The elections were declared valid in the absolute majority of constituencies.

According to the results of the two rounds of elections (the voting on 4 March and the repeat ballot on 18 March) 702,268 deputies were elected to all levels of local soviets of the RSFSR, or 89.8 percent of the total number of deputy mandates.

The elected people's deputies include: 35 percent women, 15.1 percent people below the age of 30, 49.1 percent members and candidate members of the CPSU, 6.6 members of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League]; 34.2 percent were deputies of local soviets of the previous convocation; 96.6 percent work in, and 96.4 percent live in, the territory of the relevant soviets. Of the deputies elected, 24.9 percent are workers and 20 percent collective farm workers. In 1,697 electoral constituencies, the repeat ballot was declared invalid or as not having taken place. Additional repeat elections are to be held in these constituencies.

In 1,101 constituencies a repeat ballot was conducted for elections of people's deputies of autonomous republics; in 14 of these no repeat ballot took place. A total of 2,530 people's deputies of Autonomous republics were elected as a result of the two rounds of elections; these comprise 9.2 percent women, 9.2 percent workers, 5.9 percent collective farm workers, 3.5 percent people under 30, 88 percent members and candidate members of the CPSU, 1.2 percent members of the Komsomol; and 18.4 percent were deputies of supreme soviets of autonomous republics of the previous convocation.

Moscow Gorkom's Present Role Surveyed

PM2803084990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of Moscow CPSU City Committee, by A. Ilin and Yu. Kazmin under the rubric "Party and Perestroyka: Toward the 28th CPSU Congress"; conducted in Moscow, no date given: "Time for Decisions and Actions"]

[Text] [PRAVDA] The materials for the 28th CPSU Congress are being actively discussed in the capital's party organizations. Moscow Gorkom [city party committee] was—by tradition, you might say—the first to hold a plenum on the draft precongress platform of the Central Committee. I would like you, Yuriy Anatolyevich, to comment on what are, in your view, the Moscow communists' most important assessments and suggestions.

[Prokofyev] You said: By tradition, the first to hold a plenum.... We too—I mean members of the Moscow Gorkom Bureau and secretaries of raykoms [rayon party committees]—had doubts: Is there any need for haste? Indeed, there did exist a tradition whereby we hastened to approve and support the Central Committee's decisions without having had time to comprehend them. This rebuke was heard this time, too. But, nevertheless, we decided not to delay the discussion, because the draft platform had elicited very keen interest and ambivalent opinions from different categories of Muscovites, including Communists. We consulted the aktiv and considered it necessary to express without delay the gorkom's viewpoint on the draft platform and to mount a debate in primary party organizations.

It is not just for form's sake that the draft Central Committee platform has been submitted for general discussion. Precisely for discussion, not for the usual "approval." This means that maximum use must be made of the entire party's intellectual potential. And it is necessary to prepare a document which can be presented to the 28th CPSU Congress. We regard the gorkom plenums held on the results of the February and March Central Committee plenums as the start of the second stage of the debate taking place in the city organization on the place and role of the party in society, and on ways to democratize it.

[PRAVDA] Will the gorkom's opinion not "pressure" party organizations and prevent them from defining their own attitude? Perhaps they should first be given an opportunity to discuss these materials and then to generalize at the gorkom the suggestions from the "grass roots"?

[Prokofyev] Under other circumstances, that is evidently what we would have done. But we have too little time now. A leisurely approach to preparing for the 28th Party Congress is unacceptable. As for the draft platform, the gorkom plenum merely evaluated it as a whole and confirmed that, despite all the shortcomings, it can serve as a basis for further work. So there is definitely still scope for the collective creativity of the capital's communists. Following the discussion in primary organizations, we will return once more, or maybe more than once, to the draft at a gorkom plenum.

Now a few thoughts on this Central Committee document. The draft platform is the accumulation of the thoughts and sentiments of communists at the present stage. In my view it still does not take full enough account of the longer-term prospects, the processes that will develop in society after the amendment to Article 6 of the Constitution.

The section connected with resolving socioeconomic problems has also been inadequately elaborated. You can sense a certain pretentiousness and a similarity with election promises. It is necessary to define more clearly the economic strategy of our society's development and to involve the earnest forces of scientists and specialists in this.

[PRAVDA] You frequently hear now the idea that private ownership alone will open up our path to economic prosperity. And yet no form of ownership in itself produces a return but requires an integral infrastructure for self-realization. If private ownership is a panacea, on what, then, are Western economists working and why are people in the United States, let us say, so intensively improving both the theory and the practice of management?

[Prokofyev] I agree that there is quite a lot of oversimplification and even scholasticism in our present debates. In my view inflation and scarcity are also to a considerable extent the result of lightweight ideas that have held sway for years on end in our economic science and our life. And now these same people are saying that economic liberalization and private ownership will resolve everything of their own accord. But will this not lead only to the impoverishment of the larger part of the population and, conversely, to the enrichment of the other, smaller part?

How will the people perceive the country's division into rich and poor? Any form of ownership must provide for organizational-economic mechanisms to regulate it in the interests of all of society. It is necessary to work on precisely this. So as not to return to man's exploitation by man from man's exploitation by society.

[PRAVDA] The slogan of the power of the party masses, which is proclaimed in the draft Central Committee platform, is now giving rise to a great deal of debate. This really is a key question, as can also be judged from letters to PRAVDA. How will it be resolved in practice? Does the Moscow city party organization have any plans [narabotki] in this connection?

[Prokofyev] Both a serious analysis and a generalization of the practical experience that already exists really are needed here. I believe that the holding of debates in the party, for example, must not be a chance episode but a system in political work. The debate which we began last summer made it possible to a considerable degree to democratize the state of affairs in the organization and taught us to sit at a "roundtable" with opponents and to take their opinion into account. I do not favor factions within the party, but there obviously will be different platforms on very important questions of party life, and this must not be disregarded.

We are also using an institution that is new for us, namely the councils of party organization secretaries. They played an active part in drawing up the gorkom's theses and our suggestions for the February Central Committee plenum. There is, for example, the group of secretaries of party organizations of academy institutes, and the party aktiv group in Zelenograd.

A primary organization secretary used to be mainly a figure who organized the execution of the higher party organ's decisions. Primary organization secretaries now effectively shape the political line of the entire city organization. In elaborating the gorkom's political theses, we held a series of conferences of party committee secretaries. We did likewise when preparing suggestions on the procedure for electing delegates to the 28th Party Congress. And only after this did we go to the CPSU Central Committee. These are new forms of the democratization of internal party life which take account of the opinion of party organization secretaries and ordinary communists.

A practical mechanism for realizing the slogan about the power of the party masses is undoubtedly needed. And the Central Committee must define its position here. Appropriate statutory provisions are needed here, as was said at the CPSU Central Committee March plenum.

[PRAVDA] Many questions stem from the opening up of opportunities for a multiparty system. Communists evidently need clear guidelines in this connection.

[Prokofyev] What does the amendment to Article 6 of the Constitution mean? It means that the party abandons its monopoly on power. A number of practical conclusions follow from this. Let us take political organs in the Army and among Internal Affairs Ministry troops. Such subdivisions evidently must be retained there—they exist in the armies of all countries. But they must tackle educational work. A party organization cannot confine itself to political organs. These questions must be resolved without delay.

Or take social science teaching, say. This too must change. Of course, students must study philosophy and political economy, but in full, with all the theories and directions that exist in the science of the world community. And, as one of the sections, Marxist-Leninist philosophy, etc.

Take the position of the party organization at an enterprise. According to the still current statutes, it possesses the right to control the management's activity. Naturally, with the amendment to Article 6, this right has disappeared.

[PRAVDA] A question in this connection. Our party elaborates its economic policy and offers it to the people. And it must uphold it and strive to realize it. But by what means? Only through the Supreme Soviet or local soviets? Or through party organizations, too?

[Prokofyev] Of course, through party organizations too, through agitation among the masses, through work with communists who work in elected posts, on the state or economic apparatus. But primarily through the masses. This mechanism of ours is not working today. This is why serious changes in the structure of the party apparatus are needed. For example, we study public opinion extremely badly. Subdivisions are needed for this purpose. Not instructors guiding party organizations but skilled sociologists, political experts, psychologists, and advisers who could study public opinion and organize the party organization's work on this basis. Analysis groups and a press service are needed to influence the shaping of public opinion through the mass media. In short, subdivisions of quite a different kind.

[PRAVDA] Membership of the ruling party gave certain advantages. In advancement in service, for example. Now, naturally, this will disappear. Will there not be an increasing outflow of people from the party?

[Prokofyev] It is hard to forecast. Approximately 1,000 people left the Moscow party organization in 1988. Last year 12,000 joined it and 11,000 left it. I believe in principle that if the party is a voluntary alliance of like-minded people, they must be free to leave it. In my view it would be correct to conduct an exchange of party cards after the 28th congress. So that only those who support the political line formulated by the congress would remain in the CPSU. And if some outflow did take place, it should not be viewed as a tragedy. There is no denying the fact that there are quite a lot of inert people in our party, who were "drawn in" only in order to regulate its social composition.

At the same time it is important that people with different views on operational tactics can be in the party and have the right to defend their position. But the strategy must be the same for everyone.

[PRAVDA] Will it be possible to elaborate precisely this optimum program at the congress? There are forces which see themselves as the only "democratic" ones and which set the goal of winning a majority in the elections

to the congress. They talk of forming their "own" central committee. Such intentions alarm many communists, and the danger of a split in the party is seen here.

[Prokofyev] Political ambitions must not play the chief role now. I have spoken with those who represent the Democratic platform and suggested: Let us formulate joint proposals. For there will be another Central Committee plenum, and there will be the 28th party congress, where they can defend their positions. But some of them have a different line: You will not get far with the present centrist trend in the CPSU, and it is necessary to create our own party. It seems to me that they are forcing an open door with regard to certain problems. The new draft statutes are far more radical than their demands.

Incidentally, we published the "Democratic Platform" in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA back in February. Otherwise an open, honest debate is impossible. Why fear it? The people of Zelenograd have interesting proposals—they were taken into account in the speech at the Central Committee's February plenum. Secretaries of the party organizations of the Academy of Sciences brought their own document to us—it was incorporated almost in full in the gorkom plenum's appeal to the Central Committee.... If it is a question of constructive work within the framework of renewal and perestroyka, any constructive viewpoints are possible and compatible here. But if it is a question of denying the party, of an organizational split, of kindling passions, then, of course, it is impossible to achieve anything but a fire.

[PRAVDA] The Moscow city CPSU organization is preparing for its 28th conference and for the all-party congress. What new aspects have appeared in the work of the capital's communists during this period?

[Prokofyev] I have already spoken of a great deal. I will add that we recently transformed the House of Political Education into a sociopolitical center. This is not just a change of signboard. The center has opened its doors to all trends. Party clubs meet there, "roundtables" are held with informals, and there are meetings with various categories of people. We are trying to learn political work methods.

We now have 26 rayon newspapers or news bulletins. Raykom buildings are also becoming sociopolitical centers of a kind. Zheleznodorozhnyy Raykom was the pioneer here. We believe that raykoms must always be open to people. We are also changing our methods of work with the population. A whole number of discussion clubs has been set up under raykoms. But all these are just the first steps.

The gorkom's commissions have begun working more actively. Thus, the Socioeconomic Problems Commission has examined the situation in connection with Moscow's switch to economic accountability and self-financing. So far only partially, of course. We believe that a law on the status of Moscow City as the capital of the USSR is extremely necessary. It is still largely commanded by the central departments—there are some 150 of them here.

[PRAVDA] Does it not seem to you, Yuriy Anatolyevich, that the gorkom still lacks sufficiently close ties with the working class? Representatives of the intelligentsia feel far more confident on the gorkom....

[Prokofyev] I agree, we must strengthen our ties with the working class more actively. Although public opinion is mainly shaped today by the intelligentsia, the mass media, the party aktiv, and the leaders of informal organizations, you are right that the role of the working class must not be underestimated. Its interests must be studied and defended. Let us be frank, the working class has gotten least of all out of perestroyka: a small growth in wages and a big rise in prices. Is this not so? And the worker's detachment from the means of production has not diminished because he has begun electing the director. How could the party better reflect the interests of the working class? By speeding up as much as possible the transfer to new forms of management.

I recently visited the "Khimstekloplast" plant. It is a small enterprise. Old walls, old machine tools. The collective leased its own enterprise several years ago. Now they have good wages, high profitability, and waste-free production. If someone has worked for three years, the enterprise pays his income taxes for him. The plant offsets the rent of those who have worked for 10 years. There is a good system for organizing vacations, and free meals. People feel that they are in charge, are in a good mood, and realize that real concern is shown for them. But if we only proclaim slogans while continuing to expolit the worker's labor, so to speak, then the attitude toward the party will not change.

It seems to me that one of our misfortunes is instability. Perestroyka is a good thing. When the process moves toward improving things. But when there is disintegration, confusion, unobliging suppliers, the abolition of certain methods and a failure to replace them with others...? Then the working class is the one that loses more than anyone else.

[PRAVDA] We met with you at the PRAVDA editorial office when you were second secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom. What are your feelings now, in the post of first secretary?

[Prokofyev] The burden of responsibility is very great. At the same time there is the possibility of more actively implementing what was conceived and what I considered expedient and correct.

[PRAVDA] And what are your main objectives?

[Prokofyev] The democratization of the party. In words, not in deeds. Not as it is being done now. That Central Committee platform, for example, was not even discussed in the Central Committee's commissions. If it had been discussed in commissions and been published

in advance, and if Communists had then seen for themselves what changes it had undergone as a result of being discussed at the plenum, there would have been quite a different attitude toward it. I am convinced that the processes of the party's democratization will make it possible to restore confidence in it. Particularly confidence between the leadership and ordinary communists.

And again—no effort must be spared to consolidate society's healthy forces. In our vast country—with its undermined economy and tense social state of mind—further confrontation cannot lead to positive results. It is necessary to strive for civic concord. On a progressive, democratic basis, of course.

When people ask me whether I am an optimist or a pessimist, I reply that I am a realist. Because it is simply inadmissible for a political leader to be a naive optimist in our very complex situation. But if you are a pessimist and do not believe in the future—then why are you working?

Stavropol Kraykom Chairman Elected

PM2003155190

[Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 March 1990 Single Edition carries on page 4 under the headline "Kray Soviet Chairman Elected" a TASS report on the 17 March session of the Stavropol Kray Soviet which elected I.S. Boldyrev first secretary of the Stavropolskiy CPSU Kray Committee [kraykom]. The report notes that V.P. Travov, former secretary of the party kraykom, was elected chairman of the kray soviet executive committee.

Western Republics

Ukraine Bans Scheduled Pro-Lithuania Rally

LD2803134490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1145 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] Kiev, 28 Mar (TASS)—In connection with the intention of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka ("Rukh") to hold meetings on 31 March in support of "restoring the independence of the Lithuanian state," the government of the Ukraine has instructed local authorities not to permit them to be held. This is reported by all the republic's newspapers today.

The government considers that these meetings could inflict damage on relations between the republics and lead to a destabilization of the situation in the Ukraine. In connection with this, the Council of Ministers has called on citizens of the republic to show restraint, reason, and responsibility, and not to give in to emotions and provocations.

An appeal from the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee to communists and to all the working people of the republic has also been published. It says that at the present time, when the state leadership of the USSR is, on the basis of a resolution of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, taking measures to find a way out of the political crisis that has arisen in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, any attempts to exert pressure on the course of this process are harmful.

Of special importance today is responsibility, the ability to weigh every step, the appeal stresses. Meanwhile the "Rukh" leadership is trying to take advantage of any situation in order to inflame separatist feelings, so as to shatter the USSR. Inciting the working people of the Ukraine to show disrespect to one part of the population of Lithuania by supporting the other part, "Rukh" is thereby urging that the people of one republic sow discord in the life of the people of another. The decision of the leaders of "Rukh" to hold these meetings is irresponsible, adventurist and provocative, the appeal says. It is also directed towards aggravating the situation in the Ukraine, towards inflaming nationalist feelings.

The Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee appealed to all working people of the republic to show reason and responsibility.

Ukrainian Communists on Organizational Resolutions

LD2703182890 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1845 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Excerpts] The first republican conference of party workers and representatives of party organizations who support the CPSU's democratic platform and the radical renewal of the party concluded its work in Kharkov, reports correspondent Stanislav Soldatenko.

The delegates, who arrived in Kharkov from 20 oblasts, adopted a string of resolutions which advocate alternative elections within the party, new rules and a new status of the Communist Party of Ukraine, a new way of electing delegates to the 28th Congresses of the CPSU and Communist Party of Ukraine, and about the report-back election campaign within the party. The coordinating council of the republic's (?party workers) was also elected. (?The conference adopted) a democratic platform which is free of ideological, economic, social and political concepts. It advocates a party of a parliamentary type. [words indistinct] The principle of democratic centralism is rejected as undemocratic. [passage omitted]

Many speakers at the conference dwelt on the need to draw a line across the party, in other words to split it into two. Almost no one called for preserving unity. [passage omitted]

Attempts To Remove Party From Industry Reported

LD2703221190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Attempts have been undertaken recently in the Ukraine to remove party organizations from enterprises. At the request of a TASS correspondent these instances

have been commented upon at the press center of the Ukraine Communist Party Central Committee.

At individual labor collectives in Lvov Oblast pressure is indeed being brought to bear upon party organizations with the aim of forcing them to leave enterprises. Under pressure from local leaders of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka [Rukh] and the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, demands that party organizations withdraw from industry have been included in collective contracts at some enterprises in the town of Drogobych. This is being done without regard for the party organizations and in defiance of the opinion of most communists, something which is annoying many working people. People are making requests to party and soviet bodies that the competence of the decisions which are being adopted be explained. In accordance with the new edition of Article 51 of the USSR Constitution, citizens have the right to unite in political parties and public organizations and to take part in mass movements which are contributing to the development of political activity and intiatives and the satisfaction of their diverse interests. Also, Article 17 guarantees them the opportunity to perform the functions provided for in their program and rules.

It is quite obvious that the suspension of the activity of primary communist organizations and committees at enterprises is at variance with the USSR Constitution. Analogous guarantees are also provided for by the Constitution of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. It was stressed at the press center of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee that party committees will come out resolutely against attempts to impose upon public opinion the idea that it is necessary for party organizations to depart from any sphere related to people's practical activity.

Party Responds

PM2803103990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 Second Edition p 3

[RATAU-TASS report: "In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Press Center"]

[Text] Kiev, 27 Mar—Attempts have been made of late in the republic to remove party organizations from enterprises. At a TASS correspondent's request, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Press Center commented on these incidents.

Party organizations are indeed under pressure in some labor collectives in Lvov Oblast to force them to pull out of enterprises.

Actions taken against party organizations cannot be seen as anything but an infringement of one of citizens' most important constitutional rights—the right to join public organizations.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee press center stressed that party organizations will resolutely oppose attempts to foist on public opinion the idea that party organizations should pull out of any sphere connected with people's practical activity. Especially the workplace, where the party has always had firm support.

Religious Conflict in Ukraine Intensifying

LD2703123890 Kiev in Ukrainian to Europe 1700 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] In some western oblasts of Ukraine an acute religious conflict between local Orthodox believers and Greek-Catholics is still a daily occurence. So far, the quadripartite religious commission has failed to solve it. In fact, the extremely tense situation there is deteriorating even further. Thus, representatives of the Orthodox community in Lvov have seized the offices of Ivan Panchuk, the deputy mayor of Lvov.

Our correspondent, Serhiy Hubin, reports:

[Hubin] I dialled the number of Ivan Panchuk's offices. Instead of reaching the deputy mayor, the receiver was lifted by priest Ivan, of St. Yuriy's Cathedral:

[Begin recording] [Hubin] Father Ivan, what compelled you to resort to this action?

[Ivan] As you know, the Greek-Catholics have presented many ultimatums to our community. They prevent our eparchial body from fulfilling its duties; they prevent us from holding divine services in Orthodox churches. Relations are far from being normal. Our city's executive committee has taken a position which is very hard to understand. It drags its feet instead of arriving at a solution.

[Hubin] The church is separated from the state, and suddenly you seize one of the offices of local power.

[Ivan] Yes, I understand that this action of ours could be described as extreme. But what else can we do? [end recording]

[Hubin] Later I met with Yuriy Minenko, representative of the Lvov City Executive Committee, and asked about his attitude to this act by the Orthodox believers:

[Begin Minenko recording] It is an unlawful act, what else can you call the deliberate seizure of an official place? However, according to the mayor's statement, no force will be used. At present, new governing bodies of the city are being formed, and it will be for them to solve this question. [end recording]

Kiev Youth Meeting Demands Ukraine Secession

LD2803144190 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 28 Mar 90

[From the 'Soviet Chronicle' feature of the 'Soviet Union Day by Day' program; report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] An unauthorized meeting has taken place in Kiev of representatives of the Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth and the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, organizations which are in favor of the Ukraine leaving the USSR and of a capitalist course of development in the republic. An INTERFAX correspondent has reported that the participants in the meeting called in their speeches for the creation of a Ukrainian national army. According to the INTERFAX correspondent, the city's law enforcement bodies did not prevent the meeting from being held.

Ukrainian Deputies Examine Multiparty System

LD2703153290 Kiev in English to Europe 1800 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Excerpts] The multiparty system, until very recently a taboo, and the ideological challenge to the ruling Communist Party and the state institutions run by it: This issue now is transformed from discussion to real life. Conventions are being held by the Social Democrats and Anarchosyndicalists, by the Constitutional Democrats and the Liberals. And declarations on forming the party have been made by the Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka]—the national movement of the Ukraine—and the Ukrainian Helsinki Association. However, the Rukh Greater Council voted against transforming that movement into the party. That's the latest news that we got. Similar announcements on forming the Agrarian Party and the Green Party have also been made. We'll talk about it later, but now let me say that it means not simply a change of view, but a totally different rainbow of life in the Ukraine and in other socialist soviet republics.

Emotionally, this situation is a bit strange, particularly for the older generation, raised in the spirit of intolerance and rigid opposition to anything which at least theoretically could cast doubt upon the absolute truth from Marx, Engels, and Lenin. [passage omitted]

Here's secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine and People's Deputy Leonid Kravchuk:

[Begin Kravchuk recording in Ukrainian, fading to announcer's superimposed English paraphrase] We know that there is a crisis in the party, that complex developments are going on, and that inside the party there is no party unity, says Leonid Kravchuk. Now we can see three real forces inside the party: The conservatives, the radicals, and the centrists. And these forces are represented not just in the Communist Party of the Ukraine. This is our reality. [end recording]

Many explain such reality by the crisis of ideology. Doing so, many nod to Eastern Europe to prove their point. Others explain it by the personality crisis, rather than the crisis of ideas. This is the view of Vladimir Yavorivskiy, people's deputy and one of the founders of Rukh:

[Begin Yavorivskiy recording in Ukrainian, fading to superimposed English translation] We don't agree that the party today is headed by the people who have lost their prestige completely. The party lost its prestige because of such people, so you have to get rid of the shackles which these shameless people represent. [end recording]

A way out of this situation is the creation of the new parties. This process has acquired special pace after the elections to the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, says head of Rukh, Ivan Drach:

[Begin Drach recording in Ukrainian, fading to announcer's superimposed English paraphrase] About a hundred of deputies elected to the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine represent the Democratic Platform, says Ivan Drach. So in what way should they act in parliament? What can we expect of the would-be government? Now we have a committee to organize a new party. [passage omitted] We want to build a new party. Perhaps it will be called the Independent People's Party, or the Democratic Party, or the Revival of the Ukraine. [end recording]

However, the majority of the Greater Council of Rukh voted against its transformation into a political party. As to its status, Rukh should be a structure above the party, and serve as a consolidating force. That decision was made after the Rukh session in the town of Khust in Transcarpathia.

The leaders of one part of Rukh, which is the Ukrainian Helsinki Association, announced at its session that they decided to reorganize that association into a political party. This is why Radio Kiev invited one more people's deputy to take part in this program. And he is the newly elected deputy of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union Executive Committee, Oleg Shevchenko. He shares his opinions as to the future of Rukh:

[Begin Shevchenko recording in Ukrainian, fading to superimposed English translation] Rukh will exist as a nonparty consolidated structure, uniting representatives of different parties. It will not exclude the possibility of leaving Rukh for some circles of democratic trends, which might form independent political parties. I think in the nearest future we shall have at least two or three political parties. This may happen this coming spring already. [end recording]

Among the new parties that appeared on the political horizon of the Ukraine is one party having many chances for the broadest grassroots support, but very little chance to come to power. I have in mind the Green Party, and its future leader, People's Deputy Yuriy Shcherbak, will officially declare its foundation on 26 April, the Chernobyl Memory Day, but Yuriy Shcherbak doesn't think that a multiparty system is the aim in itself:

[Begin Shcherbak recording in Ukrainian, fading to superimposed English translation] Of course, it's not

enough to shout about forty or fifty parties in the Ukraine or in the Soviet Union. We should think over the following aspects: What society we shall have if it is based on a multiparty system. And I propose to work out the resolution on civil society and a multiparty, representative, democratic system. These are very important problems. How shall we register the new parties? What percentage of votes do they have? What is the quota to enter the parliament? Maybe, as in West Germany, it will be five percent. This is a very important complex of problems. [end recording]

We should realize, however, that the ruling Communist Party so far has the greatest experience in solving such problems, not only because of the Article Six of the Constitution that stated the leading role of the CPSU not long ago, and which was taken out of the Constitution upon the initiative of the Communist Party. And there are grounded reasons to foresee the subdivision of the Communist Party into several groups. Even now, it has both the Democratic Platform, a radical faction in the Communist Party of the Ukraine, and the Union of Political Clubs. The situation when the members of one party are not like-minded people is quite unique, but even this party, far from being consolidated, got nevertheless the greatest number of votes during the elections. Consequently, it has the democratic right for a leading role in society, even without Article Six of the Constitution, said people's deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine and secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party Leonid Kravchuk:

[Begin Kravchuk recording in Ukrainian, fading to superimposed English translation] For the first time in the history of our society, the party refused the monopoly of power, for the truth, and declared that it is ready to work in the conditions of political pluralism with other political parties, without any constitutional guarantees of its right for leadership. And this is not just a refusal resulting from Article Six. It means that the party chooses a new form of (?accord). It chooses the way of real democracy and political plurality. [end recording]

It is not easy to make forecasts now about the ways of how the multiparty system will develop, about the numnber of parties we'll have, and about the practical results of their activities for the people, but there is one thing that we can say for sure: Our society can no more be measured with an abacus; we have entered a totally different dimension.

Ukraine's 'Rukh' Resists Move to Form Party

PM2703094990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 p 1

[Report by own correspondent S. Romanyuk: "Rukh To Remain Rukh?"]

[Text] Lvov—We went to clarify the situation brought about by the publication of "Message No. 23" in the newspaper LITERATURNA UKRAINA.

The gist of the meassage is that there is good reason to set up a party on the basis of the progam and statutes of Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka]. The new party, as conceived by its leaders, is supposed to be an alternative to the CPSU.

A decision was subsequently adopted by the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat. It says, in particular: "As far as the political thrust of the future Rukh party is concerned... its policy will be aimed against the union state federation and in favor of a complete break with the USSR..."

The Secretariat's statement was issued on the opening day of the Rukh session. The authors of the newspaper "message" got to see it it only during the recess between sittings. USSR People's Deputy Dmitro Pavlychko took the floor: "An action group has been set up in Kiev to form a Ukrainian Democratic Party. The name is conventional for the time being... We hope for the support of people's deputies from the democratic bloc."

Pavlychko also announced he was leaving the CPSU. The same was done by the poet Ivan Drach and certain other Rukh leaders.

So how many parties will emerge from Rukh? Two? Three? Four? What lies in store for the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka? These questions remain open for the time being. But one of them was, however, given a definite answer by the session: Rukh will not be transformed into a political party. It will remain Rukh and will continue to unite the broad spectrum of political forces in the Ukraine.

Report on Student Strikes Held in Ukraine

90UN1253A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 7 Mar 90 p 6

[Unattributed article: "The SIA Reports"; "SIA" published in Roman letters, expands to Sajudis Information Agency]

[Excerpt][passage omitted] Kiev—Student strikes took place 1 March in Lvov, Vinnitsa, and Ternopol. In Lvov these were organized in all schools, technical colleges, vocational-technical schools, and institutes of higher education, with the exception of the Physical Training Institute. Spontaneous strikes took place in Kiev at institutes of the arts, the Institute of Highway Transportation, institutes of theater, and at one faculty of the Academy of Agriculture. A statement was approved at a general meeting of institutes of theater and the arts, which reads:

"The students, teachers, and party committees of the Kiev State Institute of the Arts and the Kiev Institute of Theater condemn the act of gross violation of human rights related to the liberal interpretation of the Ukase on Rallies and Demonstrations. We demand that those arrested be released immediately and that a measure of

responsibility be assigned for representatives of the organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs who are guilty of reprisals."

Belorussian Communist Party Plenum Held

LD2803082890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] A plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia was held on Tuesday. Delegates discussed the holding of the report-back election campaign and also representation quotas and the procedure for electing delegates to the congress of the republic's communist party. Matters relating to the election of delegates to the congress were passed on for examination by oblast party organisations. The plenum resolved to hold the next congress of the Communist Party of Belorussia in November of this year.

An appeal was adopted to communists and to all working people of Lithuania. It states in part: While respecting the right of the Lithuanian people to self-determination and their desire for economic, social, and cultural progress, the communists of Belorussia believe that these matters can be resolved only through strict compliance with the legislation of the USSR and bearing in mind the mutual interests of Lithuania and other republics.

Adopts Appeal to Lithuania

LD2803140190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia has adopted at its plenum an appeal to communists and all the working people of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

The events taking place in Lithuania are causing communists and the working people of Soviet Belorussia deep anxiety and alarm. The forces which came to power in the last elections are striving to change the state system in the Lithuanian SSR and to restore a bourgeois system, the document states. Whipping up nationalism and hiding behind slogans about independence and sovereignty, militant politicians are, in actual fact, putting the cause of perestroyka in the republic and in the country in danger.

The document notes that the Great October Revolution gave the Lithuanians and the Belorussians the opportunity to set up their own national formations—the Lithuanian and Belorussian SSR's. The Belorussian SSR welcomed the reconstruction in 1940 of the Lithuanian SSR and its entry into the Soviet Union. The fiery years of the Great Patriotic War have remained in the memory of generations living today. Today we are pained by news of moral terror being used against communists who have remained in internationalist positions, calling for preserving the unity of the USSR, and of attacks against the Soviet Army and of outrages against things sacred to us, states the Central Committee.

It has already become obvious that separatist, nationalist forces are striving to destroy in people's consciousnesses the feeling of belonging to the united family of Soviet peoples. Giving a distorted interpretation to the slogan of sovereignty, they are in fact leading matters toward self-isolation and alienation, and to the severance of economic and spiritual ties with other republics, and are maliciously slandering the USSR and the CPSU.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia, while respecting the right of the Lithuanian people to self-determination and their desire for economic, social, and cultural progress, believes that these matters can be resolved only through strict compliance with the legislation of the USSR, and bearing in mind the mutual interests of Lithuania and the other union republics. We have a common responsiblity for the future of socialism, the document states.

Situation in Moldavia Reported 'Deteriorating'

LD2803140490 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] The socio-political situation in Moldavia is deteriorating. In connection with this the local papers have published a decision by the presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet. It warns that the state organs may be faced with the necessity of introducing a state of emergency in individual localities if laws are not respected. Total responsibility for this would fall upon the organizers of the disorders. This decision was prompted by the unauthorized processions, blockading of transport, and picketing of government buildings which have taken place in Kishenev, the Moldavian capital. Around 20 people are on hunger strike in the center of the city. They justify their personal protest by demanding the punishment of a number of leaders. A special commission has been set up to examine their demands.

Caucasus

Armenian Party Leader Discusses Restoration

NC2803104190 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Construction and restoration in the earthquake zone were discussed during an expanded meeting in Yerevan on 23 March. Suren Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, spoke at the meeting and said: The situation in the republic remains complex and tense. Thousands of people's chances have been ruined, and homes have been destroyed.

He continued: In the wake of the outbreak of the disaster, tens of thousands of families from all over the republic dispersed to different corners of our country, and 530,000 remained homeless. Nearly 300,000 were forcibly uprooted from the neighboring republic, and more than 400,000 were jolted from their normal living conditions.

He added: There is also the complex political situation, which is created by exacerbating interethnic relations in the region. All this has created an extraordinary situation in our republic.

Arutyunyan continued: I think we all agree that confidence in the future can only be generated by reunifying the families. Therefore, speeding up construction and restoration in the disaster zone is socially and politically important. Again we are obliged to revive the restoration of the earthquake zone.

Situation Remains Tense on Armenian Border

Emergency Declaration Urged

NC2803060990 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 27 Mar 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The communists in Baku have sent a telegram to Comrade Gorbachev in connection with the armed Armenians' banditry in the border settlements of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] on 24 and 25 March. The telegram said:

The activities of the Armenian extremists are [words indistinct] creating bloody clashes, spreading shameful [word indistinct] in the entire world that neighborly relations with the Azerbaijanis are impossible, making (?calumnies) against the Azerbaijanis, trying to wrest the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] away, and moving to establish a government remote from socialist and democratic ideals in the Armenian SSR. In view of the fact that the Armenian SSR's government organs are unable to obstruct the criminal activities of the extremist forces or do not wish to do so, we urge you, as the president of the country, to declare a state of emergency regime in the Armenian SSR's border rayons in order to effectively disarm the Armenian bandit groups.

Do not allow new bloodshed once again.

Azerbaijan Asks For 'Safety' Measures

PM2803115590 Moscow KOMSOMLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 p 1

[F. Ismaylov report under the general heading: "Transcaucasus, 27 March"]

[Text] Baku—Newspapers today carried an announcement by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers: "Proceeding from the dangerously explosive situation connected with the increasingly frequent attacks on the republic's border population centers, the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers has put to the USSR Government the question of adopting without delay a package of measures to ensure citizens' safety and their peaceful life along the whole length of the border with Armenia. It is a question of creating a system to protect the border zone against possible armed attacks."

Baku Communists have addressed an open letter to M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. "The Azerbaijani people," this document reads, "support measures aimed at restoring the traditional good-neighborliness and expect their just rights and state sovereignty to be reliably protected by union organs."

Troops' 'Pressure' on Armenian Villagers Denied

PM2103122190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Mar 90 First Edition p 4

[TASS special correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Gondusov report: "Accusing the Troops Again...."]

[Text] The republic newspaper KOMMUNIST published in Yerevan has featured an appeal from the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. What it says is alarming. It mainly covers the fate of the Armenian villages of Azad and Kamo, located on the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR's Khanlarskiy Rayon, whose inhabitants have long lived in an atmosphere of fear and open blackmail accompanied by violent actions.

Unfortunately, the reasons behind the tense situation in which the villages found themselves have clearly been distorted in the appeal. It is claimed that deportation of Armenian families and pressure on inhabitants to leave their homes and their ancestral lands have allegedly been taking place with the assistance of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs internal troops. They are allegedly whipping up feelings. This is insulting, but the main thing is that it is an unjust charge.

As Colonel L. Vakulich, a representative of the Internal Troops Political Directorate who has been in Khanlarskiy Rayon for more than a month, attested, at the request of Armenian villagers officers have been helping to arrange contacts with the Khanlarskiy Rayispolkom [rayon soviet executive committee] as well as safeguarding security. There is a dialogue between the two sides. But the servicemen were not privy to the discussion of questions concerning the fate of the Armenian villages—particularly the sale of houses. The fact that this step was taken by the inhabitants themselves without any intervention from the troops is shown by the decision of their meeting.

A meeting between the Azerbaijani and Armenian ministers of internal affairs was held in Azad Village 7 March by Colonel General Yu. Shatalin on the instructions of the USSR minister of internal affairs. There is a full record of their talks. General Shatalin had no powers to interfere in the fate of the Armenian villages, and he

warned those present of this fact. The troops' task lies elsewhere—to prevent bloodshed and avoid new casualties.

Armenian Leader Advocates Independence

AU2803101790 Vienna WOCHENPRESSE in German 23 Mar 90 p 30

[Interview with Ashod Navarsatyan, chief of the Armenian National Army, by Herbert Maurer; place and date not given: "We Were Prematurely Born"]

[Text] [Maurer] Many politicians are coming to see you now. How does that square with the essence of an army? Or is it the result of the purely strategic war of attrition following the armed conflict?

[Navarsatyan] As long as our group has existed—almost two years—our goals have always been of a democratic, meaning a political, nature. When we were founded, there was no talk about fighting and arms, even though our arguments at that time anticipated the present situation and our readiness to fight. Independence is also a military term and, speaking about democracy, we consider it a national concern. We assume that there must be a real authority of the people, which we represent now. There are no symptoms of weariness, but there is a specific program.

[Maurer] You differ substantially from the other opposition movements in the republic, such as the HHSH [expansion unknown], allegedly the largest national movement. This movement is primarily trying to pursue the parliamentary way....

[Navasartian] The political character of the HHSH is not entirely clear; that has something to do with its internal structure. Even though the movement describes itself as a parliamentary platform, its arguments are doctrinaire; it argues only as HHSH without taking the diverse other opinions into account. I think that, on the whole, parliamentary work in the republic is not convincing on the official level. That is why the HHSH uses us as the mouthpiece for its purposes time and again.

[Maurer] How do you assess your own authority among the people? Is it not very dangerous to work on an autonomous basis, so to speak, without meeting parliamentary prerequisites?

[Navasartyan] We know through our meetings how actively people take part in our work. Hundreds of voluntary soldiers who have joined us recently are probably an additional argument. In addition, we want to take part in regular policy—not as an organization or movement, but through figures who are members of our group and run as candidates in individual elections.

[Maurer] You are apparently pursuing two goals—the first, which is a long-term goal, is to get established politically very carefully; and the second, short-term, goal is to carry out your program now, if possible, with your own military means.

[Navasartian] I do not think you can separate the one from the other. In addition, I would use the term "political goal" with care. We do not represent any group interests; we exist for one purpose—to save our country's civilization from imminent destruction. So, what we are doing has nothing to do with partisan interests, and does not have to get the blessing of parliament. Everybody knows that the point is to survive, and therefore, we all pull together, including in effect also the HHSH which does not get lost in any bureaucratic considerations either.

[Maurer] What is the aim of your policy? What is your notion of a new Armenia?

[Navasartyan] We share with all independent forces in the Soviet Union a deep mistrust of the Red Army. In our own experience, it is by no means neutral and does not act as a mediator, but represents the interests of the empire. The only chance of survival for our nation lies in independence. We must get rid of this yoke.

[Maurer] But on the other side of the border are the Azerbaijanis who will probably not accept Armenia's independence as a foregone conclusion.

[Navasartyan] I think we can successfully defend ourselves against our neighbors. Incidentally, their aggression is largely based on Soviet propaganda. The nations in the Caucasus region have been in a glass house for decades. We are lacking tolerance and experience. Our freedom—once we have achieved it—will be a sort of prematurely born baby, probably a very helpless entity. However, our political talk must also have real consequences, and that is what we are there for. We, too, want to create a national council to replace the present Soviet order. This people's representation will then help ease the tense situation, particularly by international contacts and appeals.

Armenian Party Committee Discusses Platform

NC2503112190 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 25 Mar 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] According to a report in the paper, Armenian Communist Party Central Committee's State and Legal Affairs Committee met and discussed the draft platform of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee for the 29th Congress of the Armenian Communist Party. Specifically, it discussed those elements of the program which refer to the further democratization of Soviet society, the creation of foundations for a law-based state, and the consolidation of socialist democracy and legality.

The participants in the meeting noted that the draft platform of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee must reflect the dedication of the republican party organization to the principles of a law-based state and self-administrating socialist society. The committee

pointed out that the (?platform) must also reflect the need to upgrade the quality of the military service [word indistinct], improve the military and patriotic education of the young, (?strengthen the military educational base at the military institutes), and expand the training of specialists for the Armed Forces.

The meeting also touched upon the [words indistinct] process, issues relating to the broadening of openness, and other problems which, in the opinion of the committee, have to be included in the republican party organization's draft platform.

Arutyunyan, minister of internal affairs; Ashrafyan, minister of justice; Melikyan, first secretary of Ashtarakskiy rayon party committee; Merchikyan, and others spoke at the meeting.

The committee put forward a number of additions and criticisms as regards the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee's draft platform for the congress of the republic's Communist Party.

The paper carries an ARMENPRES report on the meeting of the state and legal affairs committee of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee.

Yerevan Experiences Air Link Difficulties

NC2703132390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Recently the air link between Yerevan and Stepanakert has been working with certain disruptions. There were not as many flights as planned. News is circulating in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] to the effect that the local military commandant, General Safonov, blames the Yerevan pilots for the irregular helicopter flights.

Our reporter asked Ovannes Yeritsyan, head of the Armenian civil aviation department, to comment on this claim by the commandant and he said: To put it mildly, this claim does not conform to the facts. We have always been and remain ready to fly as many times as possible to Stepanakert. As for Safonov's claim, we are interested in knowing why after our fourth or fifth daily flight, armored carriers appeared in Stepanakert's airport recently to disrupt our flights. According to the procedure in our ministry, the civil aviation department and local Soviet authorities must agree to organize local flights. The Yerevan-Stepanakert air link is such a (?local flight route), and the authorities in Stepanakert are not against the flights. Since 1 March, we have included 10 (?daily) flights to Stepanakert in our flight schedule. Two flights are also made from Leninakan, and one each from Goris and Martuni.

Despite the fact that all these flights are official, we are encountering certain difficulties. Often the air-contollers at Agdam airport violate the [word indistinct] norms and refuse to establish radio contact with our pilots, therefore making their flights difficult. It takes the pilots almost 10-15 minutes of additional flying time until the helicopters enter Stepanakert air control region. I want to inform our compatriots in Artsakh that the pilots of the Armenian civil aviation department are ready to carry out not only their official but also their citizens' duty to organize the uninterrupted functioning of the air link from Yerevan to Stepanakert and back.

Azerbaijan Report on Presidential Rule Disputed

NC2703133190 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 23 Mar 90

["The President Has Given No Such Promise"—ARMENPRES headline]

[Text] Yerevan, 23 Mar (ARMENPRES)—The mass media in Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] has published a report by AZERINFORM entitled: "There Will Be No Presidential Rule in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]." According to that report, USSR People's Deputy Kafarova, chairwoman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, has specifically stated that Mikhail Gorbachev put the Azerbaijani delegation at ease by allegedly saying that no presidential rule will be introduced in the NKAO. According to AZERINFORM, this meeting took place on 12 March during the recess on the first day of the congress. That means it was two days before the legislation on the presidency was adopted and three days before M.S. Gorbachev was sworn in as the country's first president.

Could a prospective president have made such a statement before election to that high office?

ARMENPRES asked USSR People's Deputy Zori Balayan this question, and he replied: "We, the people's deputies elected from the NKAO, asked Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, about this. According to an AZERINFORM report, he took an active part in the 12 March conversation. Lukyanov informed us that Gorbachev has made no such promise and that such a promise is ruled out."

Yazov Clarifies Baku-Sumgait Highway Accident

LD2703152090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 12, 25 Mar 90 p 7

[Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov reply to inquiry from People's Deputies Sergey Stankevich, Juokas Olekas, and Nikolay Medvedev: "Defense Minister Answers Deputies' Inquiry"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Following an eye-witness account of the January events in Baku by film director Stanislav Govorukhin (No. 7), USSR People's Deputies Sergey Stankevich, Juozas Olekas, and Nikolay Medvedev have sent an inquiry to Soviet Defence Minister Dmitry Yazov. Here we publish the minister's answer.

"Dear comrade deputies,

"In an answer to your inquiry, I would like to tell you that the Chief Military Procurator's Office has checked up on the information contained in Stanislav Govorukhin's article, 'A Rehearsal?' (No. 7, February 18), about a tank smashing into a car and killing three scientists who were in it.

"It has been established that on January 22, 1990, at about 10 a.m. a tank column was proceeding along the Baku-Sumgait highway at a speed of 30 kilometres an hour. Moving fifth in the column was an infantry fighting vehicle (IFV-I), with number 568 on its side board and driven by a Private M.

"On the 25th kilometre down the road, the driver noticed that the IFV moving in front of him took a sharp turn to the left to bypass a car, VAZ-2101, standing on the carriageway. In violation of the traffic rules, Private M. didn't do anything to stop the vehicle. Due to an insignificant distance separating him from the IFV moving in front (according to M., within 10 metres), the driver failed to react to the situation, and, as a result, hit the car with his right caterpillar track. Two of the passengers in the car—staff members of a research institute under the Azerbaijanian Academy of Sciences, I.I. Ibragimov and S.G. Mamedova—died on the spot, while I.G. Mursakuliyev and P.R. Mustafyeva, with bodily injuries, were taken to a hospital in the city of Sumgait, where Mursakuliyev also died. The fifth passenger, I.M. Akhmedov, who had no serious injuries, was taken straight home.

"The Apsheron Regional Department of Internal Affairs of Azerbaijan have started legal proceedings and passed the case to the local branch of the Military procurator's office.

"The investigation is being supervised by the Chief Military Procurator's Office.
[Signed] "D. Yazov"

From the Editors: As the investigation is still under way, we will not name the driver mentioned in the minister's answer.

Stolen Explosives Recovered in Azerbaijan

PM2603122990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[AZERINFORM-TASS Report: "In Azberbaijan SSR KGB and Ministry of Internal Affairs"]

[Text] In January this year a group of criminals, taking advantage of the extremely complex situation in the republic, because of the negligence of individual officials discovered at the Ali-Bayramly railroad station a car containing explosives and stole a large quantity of boxes containing ammonite and black powder.

As a result of the explanatory work conducted among the city population by the republic's KGB and ministry of internal affairs, as of 24 March over 600 boxes of ammonite (14.5 tonnes) and 38 boxes of black powder (over three tonnes) had been voluntarily surrendered.

As was reported earlier, those who have voluntarily surrendered weapons, explosives, and ammunition are relieved of criminal responsibility.

USSR-Iran Border Opened For New Year Festival

NC2503095090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 23 Mar 90

[From the republican press review]

[text] In accordance with an agreement reached between the Soviet Union and Iran, dozens of people were able to officially cross the state border to meet with their relatives during the new year festival—that is, from 21 to 23 March. Meanwhile, the residents of the Iranian border rayons also requested to be allowed to visit their relatives in the Soviet Union during the same period.

You can read more about this matter in AZERINFORM correspondent Allakhberdiyev's report in today's newspapers entitled: The New Year Unites the Peoples.

Gumbaridze Speaks at Georgian Komsomol Congress

LD2203041590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 21 Mar 90

[Text] To end our roundup of the important events that have taken place in our country today, a report on the extraordinary Congress of the Georgian Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League]. It opened in the youth village of (Shavnabad). Debates on the political report by (Cecilia Gogoberidze), first secretary of the Georgian Komosomol Central Committee got under way.

Givi Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, chairman of the Republican Supreme Soviet, also addressed the Georgian Komsomol congress.

The congress is continuing its work.

NKAO Soviet Decides To Resume Functions

NC2803101590 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] During the session of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast's [NKAO] Soviet of People's Deputies, the deputies discussed resuming the functions of the 20th convocation of the NKAO Soviet of People's Deputies and its executive committee.

Considering the social and political situation in the NKAO;

considering that the USSR state authority's highest bodies have accepted that it is necessary to resume the NKAO soviet of people's deputies' functions;

and being cognizant of the responsibilities of the deputies of the oblast soviet toward the autonomous oblast and its peoples' fate;

the session decided to resume the functions of the 20th convocation of the oblast soviet of people's deputies and its executive committee in accordance with the Soviet Constitution.

The session instructed the oblast soviet executive committee to formulate the work plan for the soviet and take measures to restore working conditions so the oblast's national economy operates normally. The session called on the conflicting sides to refrain from arbitrary acts and to solve all problems democratically.

Dispute Over NKAO Radio, Television Continues

NC2803113390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Inhabitants of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] are still deprived of the possibility of listening to local radio and television. The two months of negotiations between the NKAO television and radio broadcast committee and the commandant of the state of emergency district have produced no practical results. Why is this?

Sogomonyan, chairman of the oblast television and radio broadcsat committee, told an ARMENPRES correspondent that the military authorities blame our collective and say we refuse to work. This is not correct. As far back as January, we appealed to the commandant to create the conditions necessary for the television and radio studios to function normally. For example, one major impediment is that the Shusha relay station personnel have not given us a transmission line. Our work is also disrupted because the Azerbaijani leaders' representatives in Stepanakert are trying, through the soldiers, to impose their views on us. This contradicts the interests of NKAO's Armenian population. We are still of the opinion that the commandant should only supervise the operations of the mass media in order to prevent the latter from instigating inter-ethnic conflict. Only we should decide on the actual themes of the broadcasts.

At the time, we had already made our position clear to Foteyev, chairman of the Union Monitoring and Observation Commission, and to the union state committee for television and radio broadcasting, USSR journalist union, and other pertinent officials. However, nothing was achieved. I think there is some other reason why the commandant refuses to come to an agreement with us. They are adamantly bent on again bringing us under the jurisdiction of the state television and radio committee of the Azerbaijan republic. Naturally, our collective can in no way agree to that. The NKAO television and radio broadcast committee is a structural part of the executive committee of the oblast soviet of people's deputies and its legal status is defined by it.

Regarding the claims that we are unwilling to work, I would reply that our reporters are regularly preparing reports and are waiting for the opportunity to go on the air.

Transcaucasus Rail Traffic Halted Again

PM2803120190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 p 1

[V. Aloyan report under the general heading: "Transcaucasus, 27 March"]

[Text] Yerevan—In connection with the exacerbated situation on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan rail traffic has once again come to a halt.

"The neighboring republic's railroad workers," V. Asriyants, deputy chief of the Transcaucasus Railroad's Armenian Department, said, "account for this by claiming that traffic safety is not being ensured. The permanent way has been restored on the Karchivan-Megri section, and this sector is guarded by troop subunits. Traffic has also come to a halt at the Idzhevan junction of the two railroads, although previously there had been no extraordinary occurrences or conflicts there. Not a single car has traveled on this branch line since 0600 on 26 March."

A blockade?

Central Asia

Newly Elected Uzbek President Interviewed

LD2603194890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In Tashkent, deputies of the Uzbekistan Supreme Soviet are discussing problems of acute concern to the republic. One of its important events has been the election of the republic's president. You will know from reports that he is Comrade Kharimov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee. The president of the republic has given an interview to "Vremya."

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] Islam Abduganieyevich, what has brought about the introduction of a presidency here in Uzbekistan?

[Karimov] I would like first of all to say that this isn't copying the experience of the Union. In my view, this is primarily the result, like a link in the chain of the cardinal measures that are being taken and implemented in the country, cardinal measures for restructuring all spheres of our life. The act that was taken in the Union, the election of Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as president of our whole country, is the beginning that will probably lead to the election of presidents of the union republics, and the fact that we have been the first is also one of those, let's say, acts which bear out that

Uzbekistan shouldn't always be the last. The republic's presidency is primarily a strengthening of sovereignty, of economic and political independence, not in words but in deeds, within the framework of a single Union federation, and this stems from the CPSU Platform for the 28th congress of our party.

[Correspondent] Islam Abduganiyevich, what will presidential power provide in resolving the most acute social matters in Uzbekistan?

[Karimov] The introduction of the presidency will, in my view, make it possible, primarily, to strengthen executive power. Those people who are entrusted with these duties today, people who are obliged to address pressing problems, and for whom the roads are open but as yet are not doing this, I think that presidential power will, primarily, make it possible to enhance their responsibility in those areas where it is clearly necessary to use power so that there might be order, so that there might be discipline in all spheres of our life, both for the protection of the interests of our citizens, and in order that the matters which are waiting, and cannot be postponed any longer, might be addressed. Our republic has at its disposal all the necessary resources to ensure normal life and prosperity, primarily, for its own people, all those who live on the territory of our republic. [end recording]

Uzbekistan Supreme Soviet Meets, Views Treaty

LD2703231490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] At the Uzbekistan Supreme Soviet session, the government's program for the 13th five-year plan period was today expounded by Comrade Mirsaidov, the new head of the republic's government. Work will be constructed on the basis of a new Union treaty within the framework of a renewed Soviet Federation. The government considers it necessary to make radical changes in the relations between Uzbekistan and the center and to guarantee the real state and economic sovereignty of the republic.

Preliminary Kazakh Election Results Published

PM2703090990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent T. Yesilbayev report: "Second Round Ahead"]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 26 Mar—Elections of Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic people's deputies were held last Sunday. According to preliminary data, approximately 84 percent of the electorate participated in the voting.

The first round of the elections brought forth 131 deputies. A runoff is to take place in 126 electoral okrugs, in which 252 candidates are seeking seats. In addition, repeat elections will take place in 13 okrugs where one or two candidates were running but failed to get more than half of the votes. The Central Electoral Commission has reported that the following, for example, have not been elected to the Supreme Soviet: three Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee department heads, the second secretary of Chimkent Obkom [oblast party committee], a secretary of East Kazakhstan Obkom, the first secretary of Alma-Ata City party committee, and the chairman of Pavlodar Oblast Soviet Executive Committee.

Electoral Turnout Viewed

LD2703220290 Alma-ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1500 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Elections of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] people's deputies were held on 25 March with a good turnout at polling stations. The Central Electoral Commission reports that according to the preliminary data, 83.9 percent of eligible voters took part in the voting. However, the outcome varied according to region.

The highest turnout was in Kayl-Orda Oblast where over 91 percent voted. The lowest turnout was in the capital of Kazakhstan only 72.5 percent. Deputies were elected in 131 out of 270 constituencies. In 126 constituencies repeat elections will be held in which the two candidates who received the highest number of votes will take part, and in 13 constituencies there will be repeat elections with new candidates being nominated.

About 92 percent of voters in Merke constituency No. 86 voted for Nursulatan Abish-ogly Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee and chairman of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet. Uzakbay Karaman-ogly Karamanov, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers won 82 percent votes at Makhanbet constituency No. 69. In these two constituencies there were alternative candidates. It is reported that all four first secretaries of oblast party committees at their own constituencies won their seats but not one social group of candidate deputies was left unscathed. Losses were suffered by party and local soviet officials who took third place among candidates after heads of enterprises, state and collective farms and also workers and collective farmers.

Some heads of departments of the communist party of Kazakhstan Central Committee and secretaries of the oblast party committee and other committees, chairmen of local soviet executive committees were not elected to the republican parliament.

Kazakh Party Central Committee Plenum Reported

LD2203104890 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1500 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Excerpts] The 20th Plenum of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee was held today. [passage omitted]

The plenum examined the following issues:

—Election of people's deputies of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] from the communist party of Kazakhstan Central Committee.
—The draft-platform of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee for the 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan and for the 28th CPSU Congress.
—The statute of the republican soviet of secretaries of primary organizations.
—An organizational matter.

A report on the first issue was delivered by Ismaliyev, chairman of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Electoral Commission for elections and recalling people's deputies of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. [passage omitted]

As a result of a secret vote, 17 communists out of 26 candidates were elected people's deputies of the Kazakh SSR from the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, in accordance with the election law. [passage omitted] The appropriate report of the Electorial Commission will be published in the press. [passage omitted]

Comrade Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee and chairman of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet, spoke at the plenum. The speech of Comrade Nazarbayev will be published in the press.

Having taken into consideration the recommendations mentioned during the discussion, the plenum confirmed the draft-platform of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee for the 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan and for the 28th CPSU Congress. It will be published in the press for nationwide discussions at party organizations and among working people of the republic.

The plenum confirmed the statute of the republican soviet of secretaries of primary organizations.

Organizational matters were examined. Sagdiyev in connection with his retirement on pension, and Miroshnik in connection with his leaving the republic, were released from membership of the Bureau of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee.

Taking part in the plenum work was (Pedniv), senior official of the CPSU Central Committee.

Reportage on Commission for Time, Standard Hours

Kazakhstan on Summertime Hours

LD2203164390 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 0200 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] The State Commission for Unified Time and Standard Hours of the USSR reports that on 25 March the period of summertime 1990 begins. In connection with this, at 0200 on 25 March the hands of the clock [words indistinct] will be put forward by one hour.

Turkmenia Not on Summertime Hours

LD2203133890 Ashkhabad Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] As has already been announced by the State Commission for Unified Time and Standard Hours of the USSR, on 25 March, summertime 1990 starts. However, considering the numerous requests arriving from labor collectives and individual citizens of the republic, summertime will not be introduced on the territory of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic. On 25 March, the hands of the clocks will not be moved an hour forward.

Tajikistan Not on Summertime Hours

LD2303032690 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik 1000 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] At the request of the republic's government, the State Commission for Unified Time and Standard Hours of the USSR has taken the decision on transferring the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic, by way of experiment, to zonal time from 25 March to 28 September this year. In connection with this, on 25 March 1990 the hands of the clocks will not be moved forward by one hour in Tajikistan.